FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 027 10 February 1986

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Reagan Leads Public 'Astray' With Accusations [Orlov] AA 1
Soviet Scientists Appeal to U.S. Colleagues [PRAVDA 9 Feb] AA 1
Lack of U.S. Response to Soviet Proposals Examined [Shishlin] AA 3
Consultations Held in Hague on Soviet Initiative AA 4
Kobysh, Primakov Discuss Gorbachev Initiatives AA 5

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Meeting of Party Chiefs of Sections Held [PRAVDA 30 Jan] BB 1
CEMA Scientists Cooperate on Nuclear Research BB 1
Scientists Meet Press BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Gorbachev Answers Questions From L'HUMANITE [PRAVDA 8 Feb] CC 1
Marchuk Meets Meteorological Organization Members CC 13
NATO Maueuvers Off Sardinia 'New Show of Force' [Solomin] CC 13

UNITED STATES

More Reports on Senator Kennedy's Moscow Visit A 1
Kennedy Speaks on Moscow TV A 1
Kennedy, Zorin Discuss Visit A 3
Kennedy Departs Moscow A 6
Further Reports on Aftermath of Shuttle Explosion A 6
Implications Explored A 6
[Petruk in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Feb]
Inquiry Linked to Pentagon A 8
[Palladin in IZVESTIYA 5 Feb]
Discovery Launch Anticipated A 9
Cosmonaut Cited A 9
[Zheleznov]
Sagdeyev Comments on Sagan Mars Proposal A 10
[PRAVDA 6 Feb]
U.S. Reponse to Peace Initiative Awaited A 11
[Zorin]
Need for Reciprocity in Relations Stressed A 12
[Shishlin]
Kornilov Examines U.S. 'New Globalism' Policy A 13
Speech Exposes Weinberger's 'Evil Ideas' A 14
[Falin in IZVESTIYA 2 Feb]

Pentagon Wants to 'Disavow' Summit Agreement [Bogachev] A 16
Reagan's Message to Congress Analyzed [Turkatenko] A 17
Adm Crowe Testimony to Senate Panel Cited [Sturua in IZVESTIYA 8 Feb] A 19
Reagan, Weinberger Say SDI To Continue A 19
U.S. Leaders Criticize National Draft Budget A 20
U.S. Congressman Urges Progress on Arms Talk A 21

CHINA

Moscow Reception Marks Chinese New Year B 1
New Company for Soviet-Chinese Trade Set Up B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

'Team-Spirit' Exercises Condemned by USSR, DPRK C 1
TASS Statement C 1
DPRK Statement C 2
DPRK Forces on Full Alert C 2
Japan, U.S. Increasing Military Cooperation C 2

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Further Reports, Comment on Philippines Elections E 1
'U.S. Blatant Interference' [Redchenko] E 1
U.S. 7th Fleet Ready To Act [Levchenko] E 1
CIA 'Subversive Activity' Cited E 2
IZVESTIYA Views Campaign [Kovalev, 8 Feb] E 2
Shishlin on Elections E 4
Vote-Counting Continues E 5

EASTERN EUROPE

Further on Visit of Hungarian Defense Minister F 1
Tours Country [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb] F 1
Visits Belorussia [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Feb] F 2
Departs After Visit F 2
Comparison on Gromyko Talks F 2
Silayev Receives Hungarian Industry Minister [PRAVDA 7 Feb] F 3
GDR Sentences FRG Citizens for 'Espionage' [IZVESTIYA 9 Feb] F 3
GDR Embassy Marks Anniversary of People's Army [IZVESTIYA 7 Feb] F 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Shevardnadze Receives Egyptian Ambassador 7 Feb [PRAVDA 9 Feb] H 1
Ryzhkov Holds Talks With Kuwaiti Oil Minister [PRAVDA 9 Feb] H 1
Yemen Socialist Party Plenum Discusses Policy H 2
PDRY Supreme Council Meets, Al-'Attas Speaks [PRAVDA 9 Feb] H 2

Soviet Medical, Construction Teams Arrive in PDRY H 3
Libya Protests U.S. Resumption of Maneuvers H 3
Syrian Communist Party Issues Elections Statement H 3
Syrian Ambassador Departs From Moscow 2 Feb H 3
[IZVESTIYA 4 Feb]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

PCC Congress Ends; Ligachev Concludes Visit K 1
Ligachev Visits Biogenetic Center [Korzin] K 1
Conclusion of Congress Reported K 1
[Averchenko, Bogomolov in PRAVDA 8 Feb]
Castro Remarks at Closing K 2
Gorbachev Message to Castro K 3
[PRAVDA 9 Feb]
Castro Receives CPSU Delegation K 3
Ligachev-Led Delegation Departs K 4
[PRAVDA 9 Feb]
Solomentsev Meets Delegation K 4
New Government Established in Haiti K 4
Government Council Formed K 4
Duvalier Evacuated by U.S. K 5
Exercise Pressures Government K 5
U.S. Marines 'Ready' [Kalyagin] K 5
'Parliament' Dissolved K 6
Army Mobilized K 7
Call for Punishment K 7
U.S. Role Viewed [Chirgir] K 7
Attempt To 'Preserve' U.S. Influence K 8
[Reshetnikov]
Further Reportage on Caputo Visit to Moscow K 9
Luncheon Remarks K 9
[IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]
Meeting With Gromyko K 13
[IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]
'Vremya' Interview K 14
Press Conference Remarks K 15
[IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]
Leningrad Visit K 15
Visit Completion K 15

REAGAN LEADS PUBLIC 'ASTRAY' WITH ACCUSATIONS

LD082037 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1454 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] New York, 8 Feb (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Orlov reports:

The Washington administration is leading U.S. and world public opinion astray is asserting that the Soviet Union is allegedly violating the SALT II treaty.

It is not so long ago that President Reagan accused the Soviet Union, saying that the Soviet Union is not fulfilling the obligations it took upon itself within the framework of this agreement [soglasheniye] in respect to the quantity of its strategic nuclear forces. However, the White House has resorted to such a falsification of the facts exclusively for propagandistic aims in order to justify its own plans for the "nuclear rearmament" of the United States. By an irony of fate the White House's fabrications have been unmasked, this time with the help of... generals from the Pentagon. THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper has drawn attention to the fact that a report by the Chiefs of Staff, " The Military Position of the United States", recently presented to Congress, contains the "estimations of intelligence organs", which "contradict President Reagan's statements" and indicate that the Soviet Union fully adheres to its obligations.

Commenting on this report, S. Keeny, former assistant director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, condemned such propagandistic ruses by the White House. In his words the document prepared at the Pentagon "confirms that the Soviet Union continues to adhere to the obligations of the SALT II treaty." He stressed that Reagan's administration has acted "irresponsibly in the highest degree in having publicly accused the Soviet Union of violating the common limits established by the SALT II treaty on the number of strategic arms." "The estimation of the chiefs of staffs shows that the Soviet Union fully observes the required limitations," he said.

SOVIET SCIENTISTS APPEAL TO U.S. COLLEAGUES

PM081853 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

["Soviet Scientists' Appeal to U.S. Scientists" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Follows the full text of Soviet scientists' address to U.S. scientists:

Esteemed colleagues,

We, Soviet scientists, address an insistent call to you to make a real contribution to ridding humanity, stage-by-stage, of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, a concrete program for whose complete elimination by the year 2000 has been set out in detail in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15, 1986.

We, scientists, are, perhaps, more aware than people of other professions about what nuclear arms stockpiling is fraught with. At every new spiral of the arms race, the military-strategic balance and the international situation as a whole become less stable, the danger of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war increases. Therefore, we welcome the statement of the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, that any war between the Soviet Union and the United States, whether nuclear or conventional, must be prevented.

We hold that the problem of saving human civilization and mankind itself from destruction is the pivot of the common interests of countries, regardless of their ideology and the social and political system. Disarmament, the consolidation of strategic stability, the prevention of international conflicts and crises is a common and joint task. Therefore, the stage-by-stage implementation of the program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction before the end of the current century everywhere, of the consistent lowering of the level of military confrontation can and must become such a joint undertaking.

Nuclear disarmament is central to the new Soviet program. At the same time it proposes the elimination not only of nuclear means, but also other weapons of mass destruction and prevention of the emergence of new ones. Of special importance are the proposals to eliminate such barbarous weapons as chemical ones and to ban the development [sozdaniye] of non-nuclear means based on new physical principles, whose destructive capacity is close to that of nuclear or other means of mass destruction. It is also proposed to reduce conventional arms and armed forces, to adopt concerted measures for confidence-building, to ensure a reliable security in Europe, Asia, and other areas of the world, to save through disarmament considerable funds to be switched to the improvement of the living conditions of people.

We also call your attention, esteemed colleagues, to the fact that the Soviet leadership decided to extend for three months the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions. It is important that all other nuclear powers, above all the United States, should join in this moratorium, that agreement on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests be concluded. The ending of the testing would arrest the process of the upgrading of nuclear weapons.

We hold that the program for the elimination of nuclear weapons is feasible only if all kinds of space arms are banned.

The important condition for the elimination of nuclear arms, as it is stressed in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, is the implementation of large-scale measures of effective control [kontrol] over arms limitation, reduction, and elimination. Concrete agreements on disarmament must be verified [kontrolirovatsya] by both national technical means and on-site inspections [proverka], as well as through international procedures.

Undelayed pooling of the efforts of all peoples, their scientific and technical potential is needed for eradicating famine, poverty, diseases, and ensuring environmental protection and the supply of energy and raw materials to industry. Mankind is on the threshold of great leaps in space exploration which requires large-scale international cooperation. What is ahead is a more intensive use of near-earth space for the needs of economic development and science, exploration of planets of the solar system, and many other things. But these possibilities can be realized only if there are no weapons in space, no matter what functions these weapons are said to have.

Scientists play a considerable role in the radical improvement of the world situation, in the solution of fundamental problems of the present on which nuclear disarmament depends. Their knowledge and experience, their dedication to humanistic ideals must assist in every possible way the transition to a world without nuclear arms in relatively short, but realistic historical periods. We call on you, esteemed U.S. colleagues, for cooperation in the noble domain of the protection of man's sacred right, the right to live. The road is open to ridding humanity of the burden of weapons of mass destruction, of the fear of nuclear disaster. The scientists' moral duty compels them to declare honesty and clearly where the world should be advancing -- whether toward creating [sozdaniye] ever new kinds of deadly weapons increasing the danger of mutually destructive conflict or along the road of the limitation of the arms race and subsequent disarmement, of the creation of a new system of security, durable peace, and broad international cooperation to the benefit of humanity.

The address has been signed by the USSR Acasemy of Sciences, the Soviet Scientists' Committee in Defence of Peace and Against Nuclear Threat, the Scientific Council for the Study of Peace and Disarmament Problems.

LACK OF U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET PROPOSALS EXAMINED

LD100040 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The last few says and weeks have featured major international events very clearly showing the character of 1986, a year which must answer the question of whether Moscow and Washington clocks have been changed to Geneva time, a year of truth, when words are tested by deeds.

As for the Soviet Union, as we know, it acted without procrastination after Geneva. I refer, primarily, to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorgachev's statement in which a broad comprehensive plan for peace and disarmament was put forward. The plan takes the interests of not only the Soviet Union, but also those of the United States and the security interests of all big, medium, and small states into account.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in his interview to the paper L'HUMANITE, accurately and strictly said: The challenge of our age emanates from the fact that human civilization unfortunately created an extremely effective means of self-destruction. It is not even necessary to commit an unprecendented folly or crime for the very worst to happen. It is sufficient to act as has been acted in the conduct of international affairs for millennia specifically, to rely on weapons and military force and to use it when need be. These thousand-year-old traditions must now be ruthlessly broken. They must be flatly renounced, otherwise the problem of mankind's survival may prove insoluble.

Herein lies the essence, here is the core of the unparalleled nature of the contemporary period. The Soviet peace plan has a broad, comprehensive view, an essentially all-world view. It would be a mistake to regard our proposal merely as an invitation to the United States to engage in the materialization of the Geneva spirit or to translate the joint Soviet-U.S. statement into the language of practical action.

No, the Soviet initiative means something more. It is a call to all countries to unite their efforts for the sake of saving earth from nuclear and chemical armaments and naturally, of reliably banning the arms race from space and curtailing [avertyvaniye] conventional weapons. The scale of the tasks now facing mankind requires nonstandard actions and maximum honesty that is so desirable.

The representatives of the present U.S. Administration often reproach the Soviet Union, claiming that instead of engaging in the search for unravelling various complex problems connected with limiting and curtailing the arms race at the negotiating table behind closed doors the Soviets are allegedly hastneing to proclaim their ideas through the mass media.

Naturally, that reproach is not justified. It is not justified primarily because the Americans know the Soviet representatives are conducting talks and are conducting them seriously in Geneva, Vienna, and Stockholm. The reproach also is not justified because the problems which the nuclear age confronts manking with affect all countries and people alike. And, incidentally, these problems can only be solved in concert.

The Soviet peace plan is an open presentation of the Soviet view of what can be done to save mankind from a nuclear nightmare. The fact that this plan takes the security of all states, regardless of their relative dimensions, into account essentially creates a prospect for creating definite guarantees so that all countries may enjoy the blessings of peace, the blessings of international security. However, we ask ourselves if the political clocks in Washington have been changed to Geneva time. It will not be easy to answer that question. Here are the facts: The Soviet Union does not have a clear reply thus far from the United States to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement. True, some insipid words were let fall in the United States about it being a step in a positive direction, but, I repeat, there has been no official reply.

The U.S. President and Secretary of State's special aide, Nitze, has been touring Europe since 5 January [as heard]. His route is as follows: London, Bonn, and Brussels where the NATO Council session is to be held. And Rowny, special aide of the President and secretary of state has also embarked on a tour of Asia. He also has a fairly dense route. These two high-ranking Washington envoys have brought, as it were, Washington's prepared reply for consultations with their partners in Europe and Asia. And, after that, it seems, the reply to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement will be sent to our country.

It is claimed in Washington that the reply should be positive on the whole, but what meaning is given to the word positive in the United States is now simply premature to guess at. We are also aware that no serious correctives have been made since Geneva to the U.S. line of force in international affairs. If anyone needs testimony of this, then such testimony has been given in President Ronald Reagan's recent message to Congress. One message was the State of the Union and another was the administration's legislative initiatives in the coming 1987 fiscal year. There is as much anti-Soviet rhetoric in these messages as is the absolute lack of any kind of modest constructive idea directed at strengthening and preserving peace.

In the U.S. policy arsenal we are again seeing a religious, blind adherence to the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. We see a completely irresistable type of concern for one's own invulnerability while completely ignoring the security interests of other states, an expansion of interference in other people's affairs -- essentially the old line of force and, naturally, this line in itself creates huge problems in international relations. I do not want to say nothing has changed in the United States since Geneva. No, of course, the political atmosphere does not appear frozen and something is changing, perhaps some kind of psychological restructuring within political circles and the broad public is being contemplated, including a rebirth of faith and hope in the possibility of restoring detente. This, naturally, is a substantial thing and very promising in the political respect.

CONSULTATIONS HELD IN HAGUE ON SOVIET INITIATIVE

LD072347 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1921 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] The Hague, 7 Feb (TASS) -- Consultations on disarmament questions that have recently been posed by the Soviet Union have been held at the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The participants were A. Jacobovits de Szeged, general director for political affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; A.I. Blatov, the Soviet ambassador to the Netherlands; and S.B. Chetverikov, USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs special representative. Talks were also held at the foreign affairs commission of the Netherlands Parliament second chamber, the board of the ruling Christian Democratic Appeal party, and the Institute of International Relations in the Hague. During these talks there was a detailed explanation of the contents of the initiatives put forward in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January 1986.

KOBYSH, PRIMAKOV DISCUSS GORBACHEV INITIATIVES

PM041605 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 5 Feb 86 p 14

["Dialogue between journalist Vitaliy Kobysh and Academician Yevgeniy Primakov on the situation in the world after the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee": "On the Threshold of the Third Millenium"]

[Text] Vitaliy Kobysh: Our readers are already well acquainted with the large-scale package of new Soviet foreign policy initiatives set forth in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. I would like once again to draw attention to the following. First, this is a proposal for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. Second, it is a comprehensive package of measures aimed at completely stopping the arms race, in all its component parts, under a single plan: The Soviet proposals provide for the elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction, a general ban on all types of arms which have characteristics approximating such weapons, and a sharp reduction in conventional arms. Third, for the first time a time frame is set and specific stages defined for the attainment of this goal. Fourth, all the differences of opinion -- real and speculative -- which have hitherto existed with regard to verification are removed. Lastly, in order to stimulate and advance this process the Soviet Union has unilaterally adopted the difficult decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear tests.

Yevgeniy Primakov: I think it should be stressed: All this has been done at an extraordinary, exceptional moment in the course of history. The present period is characterized, on the one hand, by the exceptionally serious threat of war which hangs over the world, but on the other, by a more real possibility than in the past of eliminating that threat. All mankind is in one boat, tossed by huge waves. And in these conditions some people, intentionally or otherwise, are rocking the boat. The result is a dangerous situation for everyone. At the present time the population of the globe -- regardless of whether or not any given section of that population is a direct participant in the confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, the Warsaw Pact and NATO -- faces the problem of survival. That is a recognized fact. In any event, it is recognized by the vast majority of thinking people. But what to do in these circumstances, how to escape the danger of universal annihilation, what new approaches are needed, what new assessments should be made of particular phenomena, what new motives should guide us in our actions -- these are the most urgent, the most important questions today and they need weighty, concrete answers.

Kobysh: You said that the present moment is also characterized by a more real possibility than before of eliminating the looming threat. But this conclusion, which I share, presupposes that there are also forces on the other side -- I mean, first and foremost, leadership figures -- who could meet us halfway. Thus, although, unfortunately, the Geneva summit meeting has not yet been followed by any clear signs of a cardinal change in the position of the U.S. leaders, it is evidently possible all the same to count on a certain constructiveness in their future position.

Primakov: The very fact of President Reagan's participation in the Geneva summit meeting is, in my view, a good illustration of what you mean. And on returning to the United States from Geneva, he spoke to Congress and put forward mainly peace-loving principles. What lies behind this? As far as Reagan as an individual is concerned, it seems to me that several aspects must be borne in mind. First, whatever one's sympathies or antipathies toward the President, I should think that, having all the necessary information at his disposal, he cannot fail to be aware of the reality of the threat hanging over the world. I think that was what did the most to push him toward Geneva.

The second aspect is a certain change in public opinion. It had changed considerably even before Geneva, especially at the time when we literally begin to escalate our peace proposals, including unilateral measures in the arms reduction sphere. Nonetheless public opinion started to change radically as a result of the Geneva meeting. These changes are largely influenced by the fact that the Soviet Union made very effective use of formerly unexploited reserves. Take just one example -- our current approach to questions of verification [kontrol]. The Soviet position on this question was expounded both during the Geneva talks and in M.S. Gorbachev's statement. The crux of it is the Soviet Union's readiness to accept practically any forms of verification, including international verification or on-site inspections [inspektsiya], but of course, only if an accord is reached on the essence of the problems concerned. Everyone knows that the question of verification has always been a subject of U.S. speculations. People there tried to prove that their unwillingness to conclude agreements in the nuclear arms reduction sphere was supposedly dictated by the fact that we are a "closed society" and do not allow verification of particular accords. The Soviet Union has now completely eliminated the possibility of the use of such "arguments." Is this influencing public opinion? Yes, of course. In these conditions it is more difficult for Reagan to reject the accords reached in Geneva and avoid participating in their implementation.

Third. Reagan is clearly not averse to going down in history as a man who took a positive step in the direction of peace, as a peacemaker.

I think all these motives behind Reagan's behavior cannot be viewed in isolation from certain objective assessments. It is well known that capitalism and U.S. militarism are similar, even kindred concepts. At the same time, it seems to me that it would be wrong to represent U.S. capitalism as a system which cannot exist or develop without militarism. I also think it would be wrong to represent the political superstructure which rests on the state monopoly foundations of the United States as being linked once and for all with the process of the arms race and with preparations for war. For all its class homogeneity, that superstructure does not, in general, consist only of people who adhere to uniformly extremist, militarist views. There are people in the top echelons of power in the United States who are capable of realistic thinking and who realize that to set the goal of destroying socialism by military means is ultimately to work toward self-destruction.

Secrets of the Washington Court

Kobysh: M.S. Gorbachev's statement not only caught the U.S. Administration unawares, but, judging from the observations of U.S. analysts, gave rise to serious disagreements in its ranks. In fact, this is nothing new. It is well known that even while President Reagan was in the plane flying to Geneva, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger sent him a letter insistently demanding that he avoid any agreements with the Soviet leadership.

The question arises: Did Weinberger himself leak the contents of the secret message addressed to Reagan? If so, then evidently his aim was to severely restrict Reagan's opportunities for compromise and perhaps, even to wreck the possibility of achieving positive results in Geneva. But what if Reagan himself originated the leak, in order to show that his hands are tied and that he cannot make any radical agreements?

Be that as it may, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, you and I were in Geneva when it happened and it did not have the appearance of a mere isolated episode. The publication of Weinberger's secret letter, by all appearances, reflected a clash of different interests in the U.S. ruling class. We heard the president's national security adviser McFarlane, inundated by journalists' questions at a press conference in Geneva and in a state of considerable confusion, stating that an investigation will be carried out in Washington at once.

He was asked: an investigation by Pentagon bodies or by the White House? He replied: the White House.

Primakov: But it appears that the question sank without trace.

Kobysh: No, it did not sink -- it was sunk. And who sank it remains unclear to this day. What is clear is this: McFarlane was forced to resign as a result of differences of opinion with White House Chief of Staff D. Regan.

Here a very serious question arises: Is there some kind of confrontation, with Shultz and to some extent Reagan on once side (though that is, of course, relative; the President can hardly be called even a "centrist"), and Weinberger, Casey, and other diehard representatives of the military-industrial complex on the other? What is this? A crack in U.S. capitalism? Disarray in the face of the problems posed by the approaching third millennium? Or purely U.S. pragmatism: the struggle for a "place in the sun" and for profit, too?

Be that as it may, "profound differences have now emerged" in the U.S. Administration. Those are not my words. That is what THE WASHINGTON POST writes. Incidentally, the same newspaper made a remark on the disagreements which exist: "They are hardly an excuse for the administration's failure to prepare a prompt response (to M.S. Gorbachev's statement) which would advance the dialogue in the arms reduction sphere."

Primakov: The impression created is that in the U.S. leadership there is no complete or comprehensive consensus even on a question on which the leadership's attitude appears monolithic -- the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

But perhaps that is why, in its propaganda activity, the U.S. Administration tries so stubbornly to appear united and unshakable. SDI is unanimously presented by official propaganda in the United States as a fundamentally new idea for preserving peace.

Today, as is known, the so-called "deterrence" is based on the military-strategic balance. It could evidently be characterized as the inability of either side to prevent a devastating retaliatory nuclear strike. The Soviet Union is always raising the question of the need to lower the level of that balance while preserving the sides' identical security. That is our philosophy. And in these conditions Washington proclaims SDI as a new "mechanism" which will supposedly ensure stability in international relations. It is represented as some kind of salvation from "mutual terror," a new basis for "deterrence," a means directed against a first strike by either side.

It is true that the present mechanism for deterrence -- and here it is worth saying that it did not emerge because the Soviet Union wanted it; we were forced to take part in the arms race and ultimately to achieve military-strategic parity with the United States -- does, of course, have many defects, including psychological and moral defects. But what is offered as a substitute?

To begin with, Soviet scientists and many leading U.S. scientists working in this sphere believe, with every justification, that there is no possibility of creating even a highly effective -- let alone an absolutely reliable -- means of destroying first-strike missiles from space. True, some people in the United States claim that it is possible to eliminate a significant percentage of such missiles. Well, let us say 70 percent. But if one side knows that 70 percent of its missile potential could be destroyed, it will naturally seek to ensure that the 30 percent of undestroyed missile potential amounts to considerably more missiles than before -- not 100, say, but 1,000. This means that an unrestrained offensive arms race will be unleashed.

SDI -- Castles in Space?

Kobysh: That is so obvious, even to U.S. scientists -- I mean the thorough researchers -- that the question arises: Is it a question of some well thought out military plan which someone is imposing on the United States, and thence on the whole world, or is it nothing more than ambition on the part of the U.S. ruling class, ambition which runs counter to all common sense?

It is not easy to get to the bottom of this question now. Even in serious academic publications published in the United States, the situation is deliberately confused. In particular, they develop the idea that scientific and technical competition in space between the Soviet Union and the United States has supposedly been going on for a long time and has always affected the military sphere one way or another. This competition, such publications assert, was proceeding of its own accord. Then Reagan brought politicking into it, declaring publicly that the United States sets the goal of surpassing the Soviet Union in military research in space. In other words, the idea is insinuated that SDI always existed objectiveiy, but neither the Soviet Union nor the United States suspected it: Just like Moliere's hero who did not know he was speaking prose. Here the main question is deliberately clouded: whether strike weapons are being put in space or whether it is only a question of exercises of a purely scientific order.

This political justification, so to speak, for the "star wars" program is, as you see, rather cunning.

Now I would like to touch on another problem -- how far U.S. big business is already involved in the SDI program. It is clear from press reports that 1,500 U.S. corporations have expressed the desire to take part and some are already taking part in the program to prepare for "star wars." They have been assigned orders for decades to come: Sums amounting to billions, tens of billions, and even hundreds of billions of dollars are mentioned.

Primakov: You are right, Vitaliy Ivanovich, to formulate the problem in that way. Thousands of proposals have already been submitted by various U.S. firms and laboratories under the SDI program -- more than under any other U.S. military program. The main programs for the majority of strategic offensive arms -- the new generations of MX, Trident, and B-1 strategic bombers -- will be completed in the early nineties. According to U.S. experts' estimates, by the end of the eighties the production of delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads will begin to fall, since the stockpiled arsenal is deemed "sufficient" in quantitative terms. As for qualitative improvements, these will be less "profitable" than at present, since increasing financial resources will have to be invested in any small qualitative improvement on existing types of armaments. Obviously, the U.S. military business can hardly count on support from Congress for new programs for the production of purely offensive weapons. Therefore, the so-called defensive -- really offensive -- space programs are regarded by U.S. military business as a panacea against possible reductions in profits.

Kobysh: What do you have in mind when you talk about business: individual corporations specializing entirely in military production or special subunits within them?

Primakov: Both.

Kobysh: That is probably correct, although the problem is not that simple. A U.S. corporation today, even the most "militarized" corporation, tries to diversify production as far as possible in order to be ready for any situation. In the Boeing company, for instance, I was shown a large-scale agricultural production unit, although everyone knows that this corporation specializes in the production of aircraft and missiles.

Primakov: Yes, but nonetheless we can make deductions from the actual size of the sums invested in military production and from the profits obtained from those investments. For instance, if you consider that from 1984 through 1989 $26 billion will be appropriated to the SDI scientific and technical program, then 22 percent of that sum, which is around 6 billion, will go to the Boeing company. You can imagine what kind of a sum that is!

There is another aspect. Many companies, closing their eyes to the mortal danger inherent in an arms race in space, want to use the implementation of the SDI program to increase their scientific and technical potential. And many representatives of the military business regard SDI in general as a unique catalyst for new ideas in the arms race, including ideas not related to space.

Kobysh: All the same, there are figures which indicate that a considerable part -- or rather the great part -- of the U.S. military-industrial complex, and not just business, has still not finally decided about SDI. The very nature of U.S. capitalism is such that an efficient corporation has to give its shareholders something tangible, not just castles in space. At the same time SDI is opposed by all who put survival above profits, all who are aware of the abyss into which this program is dragging the world. I think the main international obstacle of a politico-legal nature which could bar the way for the United States to slide further and further down toward the ideas of an arms race in space is the ABM Treaty signed by the Soviet Union and the United States in 1972. SDI is in total contradiction to the articles of this treaty.

That is doubtless why the representatives of leading corporations which have associated themselves with the "star wars" program are now engaged in active lobbying in the U.S. Congress and government circles in favor of an arbitrary interpretation of the provisions of the ABM Treaty. Moreover, these U.S. companies are not averse to profiting from Japanese and West European technology, although they are rather afraid of competition. This creates yet another mass of contradictions.

It would not be correct to think that the Washington administration is marching victoriously across the world, or even across the United States, with its "star wars" program. The main reasons why this program is giving rise to protests and being fiercely criticized are well known. There is another significant aspect which is sometimes forgotten when SDI is discussed.

The point is that the trillion-dollar "star wars" venture is clearly beyond the means of the United States, or at least beyond the means of its coffers today. In the next few months the state debt of the world's richest capitalist country will pass the $2 trillion mark -- that figure is written with 12 zeros. Of course, you could say that U.S. capitalism has "reserves of strength." But the captains of the U.S. ship of state, those who are most experienced and farsighted, know well that it was playing with zeroes like this that led to the catastrophic crisis of 1929-1933. Their thoughts are troubled now.

Primakov: All the same, the real attitude of the U.S. Administration, and that part of the military-industrial complex which is behind it, toward the SDI program shows how difficult the process which began in Geneva will be. It will undoubtedly have to make its way through the big obstacles, lofty barriers, and major accumulations which are not only left over from the past, but also result from the present U.S. policy.

But however difficult that process is, it is already perceptible. This was perhaps manifested in the fact that the U.S. Administration did not adopt its usual frankly negative stance on the latest proposals formulated in M.S. Gorbachev's statement. Of course, I am far from thinking that the United States has already agreed to the Soviet proposals.

But in the conditions of the change in public opinion, it can no longer ignore them; moreover, it cannot fail to react in a proper and, I would say, civilized way.

Washington cannot fail to take account of the reaction to the Soviet peace initiatives in other states too -- its allies and the developing countries. In this respect one can surely regard as characteristic the words of Rajiv Gandhi, who said that he congratulates M.S. Gorbachev on his statement, or Greek Prime Minister Papandreou's call for the Nonaligned Movement to play an important part in the implementation of the tasks set by the Soviet Union.

Kobysh: I would like to add something about the reaction of the U.S. allies. They are not very pleased that the U.S. Administration has so far confined itself to polite words, carefully avoiding giving a substantive response. The tactics of procrastination adopted by the administration, if they continue in the same way in future, could lead to the U.S. allies' beginning to rebel.

Primakov: In fact, the process we are speaking of has begun to affect, even if not in the most radical way, the policy of certain U.S. allies. It seems to be connected to some degree, for instance, with the positive developments in Soviet-Japanese relations which emerged in the course of the visit to Japan by Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze. I was in Japan on the eve of that visit and during my conversations with the Japanese Foreign Ministry leadership and with scientists belonging to the ruling party's so-called "brain trust," I formed a clear impression that Japan is afraid, to speak, of missing the "Geneva train." Many people have begun to realize than an immovable position on Japan's part with regard to the Soviet Union could be detrimental to Japan, especially in conditions where a process of normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States has already begun to emerge to some degree.

How To Cool Down the "Hot Spots"

Kobysh: We have been talking, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, about questions relating to the strategic arms sphere. There is another topic which is also directly connected with the peoples' security interests. That is the so-called regional conflicts, or, as journalists say, "the planet's hot spots." In Geneva M.S. Gorbachev warned against the crude approach whereby all regional crises without exception are seen from the standpoint of Soviet-U.S. confrontation.

One cannot fail to see the profound socioeconomic and political factors as a result of which particular local clashes flare up. The attempt to "globalize" these conflicts while ignoring the real interests of the peoples involved and the specific situation in each region will never lead to their just resolution.

Primakov: In this connection I would like to recall that John Foster Dulles once said: All clashes in the world, if they are not in the interests of the United States, form a kind of "vacuum" into which "the Soviet Union's influence" is inevitably drawn and therefore, the United States must itself fill that "vacuum." This imperial viewpoint formed the basis of aggressive U.S. actions in various parts of the world. It seems to me that in present-day conditions attempts to present all conflicts solely from the viewpoint of the possible strengthening of U.S. positions in the struggle against the Soviet Union constitute a continuation of Dulles' line.

Kobysh: Another natural law is the one whereby local conflict situations reach an international level specifically as a result, as a rule, of concrete actions by the United States. This applies equally to the Near East, Central America, southern Africa, or Afghanistan.

Primakov: In general U.S. political scientists have recently begun to devote increasing attention to the theory of the manipulation of conflict situations. This is clearly reflected in U.S. theoretical thinking, which originated the terms "management" entirely unconnected with the elimination of the conflicts or with finding means of resolving them.

Kobysh: The U.S. perception of the means of "management" of regional conflicts is indicated by an interview U.S. Senator Metzenbaum gave to Cleveland television. At a moment -- this was in early January -- when the whole world was worried about the tension created by U.S. actions over Libya, the U.S. senator came out openly and publicly with a proposal to organize an attempt to assassinate Libyan leader Al-Qadhdhafi. The senator was quite frank: "Perhaps we have reached the moment when Al-Qadhdhafi should be eliminated."

If the United States wants to resolve regional problems in this way, the conflicts will persist for a long time in a highly dangerous form. Although I must say that the U.S. ruling class, as far as I know, is concerned about the situation in those so-called "hot spots." I was intrigued by the information which recently appeared in the Western press concerning conversations between U.S. leadership figures and a number of Latin American leaders about the situation now existing in Chile. These figures did not call, like Senator Metzenbaum, for the assassination of Pinochet, but they stated clearly that unless the present regime in Chile is "transformed," the emergence of a "Marxist state" in that South American republic is inevitable.

Primakov: That is to say, a certain section of the U.S. ruling circles is concerned about the "side effects" of their policy of installing right-wing antipopular regimes in particular countries. Many of the more realistically minded Americans are beginning to realize that this could prove very costly to the United States, since all this ultimately leads objectively to the consolidation of left-wing forces locally.

Kobysh: One important result of Geneva, as I understand it, is the progress toward the idea that real opportunities exist for both the Soviet Union and the United States to contribute to the elimination of dangerous regional conflicts. To this end it is necessary to stop exploiting these conflicts in the struggle against the Soviet Union. Naturally, the USSR's plans do not include the exploitation of any crisis situation against the United States. At the Geneva press conference M.S. Gorbachev said that security is indivisible today and that in our time you cannot build one state's security at the expense of another state, still less contrary to the interests of that other state's security. If this formula is extended to regional conflict situations, it would be possible, it seems to me, to reach agreement on a positive contribution by the two powers to the process of settling those conflicts.

Primakov: All the things we have discussed are not static problems, they are in motion. And doubtless we cannot regard the debate on any of them as completed. But if we have correctly identified the trend, then all the same, albeit slowly and with difficulty, the world will inevitably make its way to better times. The program set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's statement is mankind's route into the third millenium. It is only natural that this route, which guarantees the survival of civilization, was opened up by socialism.

INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF PARTY OFFICIALS HELD

PM311313 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Working Meeting"]

[Text] A working meeting of deputy chiefs of sections from the BCP, MSZMP, Communist Party of Vietnam, SED, Communist Party of Cuba, Lao People's Revolutionary Party, MPRP, PZPR, RCP, CPSU, and CPCZ Central Committee took place in Moscow 29 January, which discussed practical questions and cooperation in the international and ideological spheres.

CEMA SCIENTISTS COOPERATE ON NUCLEAR RESEARCH

LD312304 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1645 GMT on 31 November carries a video report on its "Community" program on the Dubna Joint Institute for Nuclear Research examining the role of fundamental science in developing projects such as atomic heat-supply stations and highlighting the contribution made by CEMA partners. A laboratory at the institute is shown containing a video display unit [VDU] resting on a piece of equipment labeled "System MERA-CAMAC 1300". A department head, pointing to the various units of a computer, explains how the processor was developed in the Soviet Union, the main memory, arithmetic unit, and floppy disks in Poland, the polychrome vdu in Hungary, the magnetic tape in Bulgaria, while the rest of the CAMAC units were developed in Dubna. The processor and memory unit are labeled "CM3101" and the floppy disk reader "CM5608". The narrative explains how scientists from various CEMA countries are collaborating with their Soviet counterparts in research being carried out with the aid of a unique fast neutron reactor, while the video shows a large hangar with a cylindrical installation about 1.5 meters high and some 6 meters in diameter. A scientist working at the institute, who is identified by a screen caption as V.M. Nazaro, explains that one area of research they are involved in is the durability of construction materials for atomic power stations currently being designed, emphasizing that, with power stations being built to last some 30 years, the concrete they are made of should be able to withstand radiation for that length of time. The video ends with other scenes of scientists at work.

Scientists Meet Press

LD292141 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Text] A meeting took place today in the Moscow Oblast town of Dubna between leading scientists of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, and representatives of news agencies, the press, and television from socialist member-countries of this international scientific organization. The meeting was devoted to the 30th anniversay of the institute which will be marked at the end of March this year. Academician Bogolyubov, the director of the institute and twice Hero of Socialist Labour, and other leaders made speeches giving information on the achievements of the international collectives in which scientists from 11 socialist countries work.

GORBACHEV ANSWERS QUESTIONS FROM L'HUMANITE

PM071636 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 86 First Edition pp 1-2

["M.S. Gorbachev's Answers to Questions From the Newspaper L'HUMANITE" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] L'HUMANITE, the central organ of the French Communist Party [PCF], asked M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to answer a number of questions.

On 4 February this year M.S. Gorbachev received R. Leroy, member of the PCF Politburo and political director of L'HUMANITE, G. Streiff, L'HUMANITE's permanent correspondent in Moscow, and (J.) Faure, chief of the paper's international desk.

M.S. Gorbachev's answers to L'HUMANITE's questions are published below.

Question: Mikhail Sergeyevich, thank you for agreeing to answer L'HUMANITE's questions. You are general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. This imparts special authority to your answers to the questions about the life of the Soviet Union that French people ask themselves, being under the constant influence of hostile attacks on your country. So here is the first question. Many people now say that the USSR is currently entering as crucial a stage in its development as that initiated by the October Revolution. Does this mean that it is a question of a new revolution?

Answer: Of course not. I think it would be wrong to formulate the question in those terms. In my view, it would be more correct to say that today, in the eighties, we are putting forward the task of imparting a powerful acceleration to the work begun by the Bolshevik party almost 70 years ago.

The October Revolution is an event that was a breakthrough in our state's 1,000-year history, and it is without equal in the past in terms of its significance and consequences for the development of all mankind. But it is not enough to accomplish a revolution -- it is also necessary to defend it and to implement the working person's ideas on equality and justice, his social and moral ideals. In other words, to build a new society capable of ensuring a life worthy of a human being.

All this demanded from our people and the party tremendous work, real exploits, and sometimes sacrifices too. The civil war and the war against Hitler's Germany, the extremely profound transformations in the countryside, the creation of powerful industry, the elimination of the illiteracy of the majority of the population, the fundamental social and cultural restructuring of society, and the formation of fundamentally new inter-nation relations -- those are just a few pages from our history, which is generally still quite short.

We are proud of our history, and this pride forms the basis of Soviet patriotism. If we had not held firm, if we had been defeated in even one of the deeds I have listed, everything for whose sake the October Revolution was accomplished would have been called into question. Each of those deeds in itself can rightly be described as a truly revolutionary achievement.

The same thing applies to the tasks that are being resolved today. They are complex and at the same time very important. If we do not cope with their resolution, we will devalue everything we have achieved at the price of enormous efforts in the past and we will complicate our future. Maybe what is most difficult but most necessary for every Soviet Communist, for the whole party, is to completely and fully understand and sense the challenge thrown down by the era and to respond to it worthily.

This challenge is a double one.

On the one hand Soviet society has entered a new stage in its history. The essence of this stage is that the needs of the development of productive forces and the needs of people are placing on the agenda the question of a very serious restructuring and improvement of many aspects of production relations, methods of economic management, and the methods, forms, and style of party and state leadership, that is, of policy. It is also a question involving increasingly broad strata of the people in the resolution of public affairs and of mobilizing their creative capabilities and experience to resolve increasingly complex tasks, that is, of further developing and enriching our socialist democracy.

We have been aware of the need for this for quite a long time now. The essence of what is now being done in the country and above all in the party is to resolutely accelerate Soviet society's socioeconomic and spiritual development, using every available opportunity for this. This is, of course, a revolutionary task.

On the other hand, the challenge of our era stems from the fact that human civilization has unfortunately created extremely efficient means of self-destruction. There is not even any need to do something unprecedentedly stupid or something criminal for the worst to happen. It is sufficient to act as people have acted for millennia -- to rely on weapons and military force in resolving international affairs and to use force when the opportunity arises. These traditions that have stood for thousands of years must not be ruthlessly broken and completely renounced. Otherwise the problem of mankind's survival may prove insoluble. In the nuclear age it is impossible to live -- at any rate, to live for very long -- with the mentality, habits, and rules of conduct of the stone age. Surely such a sharp breakthrough in international affairs and in foreign policy thinking and practice is a profoundly revolutionary task. In my view, that is precisely what it is. We, as the first country to accomplish a socialist revolution, see our greatest responsibility and our duty as being to help in every possible way to resolve this task.

In general, we regard our program of practical action, which the 27th CPSU Congress is to discuss and adopt, as a program of truly revolutionary nature and scale from all viewpoints.

Question: What are the most important prospects for the development of the Soviet economy in the next 10 or 15 years? How will this affect the people's well-being?

Answer: The prospects will depend on how well we cope with the problems that have arisen. In other words, on how well and how skillfully we work. I will speak honestly -- these problems are not simple. We have objective difficulties (the unfavorable demographic situation and the arms race that has been foisted on us are the biggest of them). There are also difficulties that have arisen through our own fault. Since their resolution was delayed, they have exacerbated.

Now we must do a very great deal within a very short period -- radically improve planning, management, and material incentives and accelerate scientific and technical progress. On this basis we must increase the efficiency and the qualitative yield of the economy and improve output quality. Over the next 15 years we plan to double the country's production potential and substantially change the very fact of our economy and the nature of labor and to restructure people's way of life.

You ask: How will this affect the people's well-being? My answer would be: It is in fact for the good of the people that we are doing all this.

Once again, I mean both the quantitative and the qualitative aspects, that is, consumption and consumer services, housing, medical services and education, social security, access to the wealth of culture, protection of the environment, the provision of amenities in cities and villages, leisure, and much else besides. I will not conceal the fact that in many of these spheres things are by no means as we would like, both because our difficult history for a long time did not make it possible to pay due attention to these spheres, and also through our own fault -- because of the inertia, inability, and sometimes the simple irresponsibility of particular officials and entire departments and organizations. If you read our newspapers you know what sharp criticism is leveled at many personnel, including very high ranking personnel, over this. We have now resolutely embarked upon rectifying the situation. This will naturally take time and considerable efforts. I am confident however, that in all these matters we will secure substantial changes. Of course, we would all like to do this more rapidly.

The most urgent tasks include saturating the market with the widest range of good quality goods. Various goods: new and traditional goods, expensive and cheap goods, goods for young people and for older people -- in short, to suit all tastes and needs, within sensible limits, of course. We regard this problem as exceptionally important.

Question: Do people still wait in line?

Answer: Yes. Especially for high quality goods, demand for which is not satisfied.

I want to note here that not all ways of solving this problem are open to us. If you in the West find that demand for some type of goods is exceeding supply, the price is raised. We do not do this at all, or almost not at all, at any rate with regard to goods in mass demand. The result is shortages. And they produce lines.

I am saying all this to explain the problem, not to justify shortcomings. Shortcomings -- we firmly insist on this -- must not be justified, but rectified. It is for the sake of this that we have now begun a serious restructuring of the economy and all economic mechanisms.

Question: Do Soviet citizens have the right and the opportunity to "object" to the actions of the "bosses" of their enterprises? And not just "object" to them, but change their decisions?

Answer: If by "bosses" you mean directors, the management, we don't have private owners or private ownership relations here. In the very first years of Soviet power a whole mechanism was created to protect working peoples's rights: strict labor legislation, broad trade union rights, party and soviet supervision. In recent years the rights of working people and labor collectives have been considerably widened. Practically all major decisions are prepared and taken with the participation of working people and after proper discussion. This applies, for instance, to draft plans for the economic and social development of enterprises.

As for trade unions, in particular, they conclude collective contracts with the management and monitor observance of labor legislation. If they think something is wrong, including the dismissal of working people, matters to do with wages, provision of housing, and so forth, they have the opportunity to "object," to use your expression, very effectively, even to demand an administrator's dismissal. This happens from time to time.

But there is another side to this. Not only management and trade union, but the labor collective as a whole must make certain demands on working people too, in terms of discipline, conscientiousness, and conduct at work.

As a rule, this is done, with the full support of the workers. The collective wants to see each of its members doing good work. All working people are committed to this and their pay, labor conditions, and social benefits depend on it.

Question: Isn't unemployment the price one has to pay for production modernization?

Answer: In a planned economy geared to the all-around satisfaction of social needs, the two things are not connected. Even if as a result of fundamental technological improvements entire specialties are no longer needed, we can and must not only see this coming, but also take steps to retrain people and, if necessary, set up new production units. That is what we actually do in practice. Since the revamping of enterprises is accompanied, as a rule, by expansion, the question of new jobs is solved at the enterprises themselves. At the moment, however, it is virtually an academic question for us, primarily because we are beset not by a surplus, but by a shortage of manpower. At the same time, I will be honest and say that there is another reason. As yet we have been modernizing too slowly, and that includes spheres where modernization is overdue. Be that as it may, the party is aware of the social aspect of modernization and considers it extremely important to take this into account when elaborating plans for the country's economic development.

Question: Is the Communist Party in the USSR the "drive belt" of the state? What meaning is attached in your country today to the expression "policymaking?"

Answer: The Communist Party is the leading and guiding force in our society. This party tenet is enshrined in the Constitution. Here we are talking about the party not as a symbol but as a real and constantly operating political organization having in its ranks almost 20 million of the most active representatives of workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia, democratic organization which elects its leading organs and its leaders and is strictly exacting toward them. Now we are striving to ensure that these democratic principles of party life and work are strengthened and the activeness of all party collectives is enhanced. This, in our view, is one of the effective tools to expand democracy and involve millions of people in the solution of production, social, and political affairs. I think that questions of the party's work under present-day conditions will occupy one of the central positions at the forthcoming congress.

It is up to the party to elaborate the strategy and tactics for the building of the new society, to implement cadres policy, and to educate the people ideologically. Party committees at all levels, right up to the Central Committee, act as organs of political leadership. The party is vitally interested in the active work by all links of our political system, it supports and gives assistance to soviets, trade unions, the Komsomol, and other mass organizations, and ensures that each one of them fully performs its functions.

You are asking about the meaning that is attached to the expression "policymaking." I must say that we do not use this expression. We say: to elaborate policy, to formulate policy, to implement policy. In my view, this more accurately conveys the essence of the matter, according to us, in any case.

So, policy elaboration for which, as I already said, the party is primarily responsible, begins with a study of the objective situation and the various needs of society and moods of the masses (public opinion in our country, by the way, is carefully studied by the party and fully taken into account by it). Political decisions are formulated on this basis following the due discussion. This process is, of course, far from simple and it can proceed in different ways, depending on the nature of the problems to be solved. Quite often the adoption of decisions is preceded by a broad and at times nationwide discussion, and consequently by comparison of or struggle between viewpoints on different questions.

That is what happens during the discussion of draft 5-year plans. This is what happened with the Constitution, with labor and housing legislation, with the education reform, and -- speaking of most recent times -- with the law on the combat of drunkenness and alcoholism.

Furthermore, the main point in the entire political process is the implementation of decisions that have been made. Without this there can be no policy. And if you have followed the discussions launched in the country after the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, you could not have failed to notice that we attach particular importance to the unity of words and deeds.

We are resolutely struggling to ensure that deeds do not diverge from words. We are struggling with the weapon of criticism. We are also struggling with the weapon of publicity and the weapon of discipline.

Question: One often hears that Soviet young people are not interested in politics and are socially inert. Is this true?

Answer: This is said in the West by our ill-wishers. However, I will say this openly: They engage in wishful thinking. We have no grounds at all to complain about our young people. They are distinguished, on the whole, by lofty civic awareness, profound interest in society's affairs, and keen interest in domestic and foreign policy. Young people are not doing at all badly -- be it at the plants, on Kolkhozes, at VUZes, or in the army. They do go to work readily, of their own free will, and -- I am not afraid to say this -- enthusiastically wherever things are more difficult, at major construction sites in Siberia, in the north of the country, and in the Far East. Some 500,000 young volunteers are now working at these sites. To put it briefly, I cannot agree at all that Soviet young people are inert or passive. We have complete political trust in our up and coming generation.

This does not, of course, mean that there are neither problems nor unsolved problems here. They do exist. We are, for example, seriously concerned because alcoholism has spread among some young people. Parasitic and consumerist feelings, bad taste, narrow spiritual interests, inadequate familiarization with the cultural heritage -- such phenomena are also to be encountered. We are well aware of them and, naturally do not overlook them. This offers a broad scope for activity by the Komsomol. Actually, it has been known for a long time that the power of example educates much better than the most eloquent sermon. I think that everything being done now in the country and the party will prove to be very useful from the viewpoint of young people's education.

Question: There is talk about the persecution of Jews in the USSR, about political prisoners, about the existence of censorship. Some surnames are also mentioned, like Sakharov for example. What would you say in this connection?

Answer: To start with, about Soviet Jews. This issue has become part of a frenzied anti-Soviet campaign, a veritable psychological war against the USSR. The propaganda of anti-Semitism, just like all other forms of racial discrimination, is prohibited by law and is a crime in our country. What happens often enough in the United States, even in France, and also in other Western countries -- defilement of Jewish graves and activities by neo-Nazi organizations preaching hatred for the Jews in newspapers and on the radio -- is impossible to occur in the USSR. The Jews in our country are just as free and enjoy as equal rights as people of any other nationality. They are active participants in the country's social and state life. Books, journals, and newspapers are published in Yiddish in our country, and synagogues operate. In my view, the importunate "attention" given by anticommunist and Zionist propaganda to the fate of Jews in the USSR is nothing other than hypocrisy which pursued far-reaching political objectives, objectives which, moreover, are removed from the true interests of Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality.

I consider that civilized society in general should have no place for either anti-Semitism, or Zionism, or any other manifestation of nationalism, chauvinism, or racism. And the question of the eradication of these evils on a global scale is very topical. The racists in South Africa have embarked on bloody repressions against the black majority of the population. Pogroms and oppression of Africans, Indians, Turks, and immigrants from other Asian countries have become more frequent in West Europe. Racism in the United States has also launched a counteroffensive in the last few years. And for how many years -- and the reasons for this are well known -- have the Palestinian Arab people been expelled from their own land?

Now about political prisoners. They do not exist in our country. Just as persecution of citizens for their beliefs does not exist. People are not tried for their beliefs in our country.

Every state, however, must protect itself against those who would encroach on it, who call for its undermining or destruction, who, finally, spy on behalf of foreign intelligence agencies. Under our laws, such actions are classified as crimes against the state. I was recently informed that just over 200 people are serving terms of punishment for all types of such crimes in the USSR.

About Sakharov. I have already had an opportunity to answer a similar question, and will therefore be brief. It is well known that illegal actions were committed on his part. This has been reported in the press on many occasions. Measures corresponding with our laws have been applied with regard to him.

The actual state of affairs at present is as follows: Sakharov is living in Gorkiy under normal conditions, conducts scientific work, and remains a full member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. As far as I know, his state of health is normal.

His wife recently traveled abroad for medical treatment. As far as Sakharov himself is concerned, he still has knowledge of secrets of particular importance to the state, and for this reason he cannot travel abroad.

And about censorship. It does exist in our country. Its task is to prevent the press publication of state and military secrets, the propaganda of war, violence, and cruelty, personal insults, or pornography. The selection of works for publication, their editing, abridgement, and so on -- is a matter for the actual mass news media and book publishing houses, their editorial collegiums, and their editorial councils. There is only one point I can add to this -- this kind of censorship exists, in one form or another, in every country. In your country, for example, it is the owners of newspapers and publishing houses, or editors hired by them, who determine what will appear in print and what will not, and people stand trial for slander or for revealing state secrets. I am not talking about the practice, already widespread in, for example, the United States, when books are confiscated from school libraries under pressure from groups of reactionaries, including -- as was reported at the last Pen Club Congress -- books by authors like Dostoyevskiy, Hemingway, and even Dickens, let alone "The Diary of Anne Frank." These are facts. Everyone knows that facts are stubborn things.

It is a pity that so few people in France and the West in general are familiar with the Soviet press, TV, and radio. We have very extensive freedom of speech and criticism. There are open and sometimes very sharp discussions in the country. This is particularly obvious now on the eve of the congress. I honestly assess as sanctimoniousness and hyprocrisy the strident campaigns aimed at "proving" that the USSR (and, by implication, socialism in general) is a society ruled by uniformity, official like-mindedness, and so on and so forth.

In our society an active life stance and the struggle against injustice and violations of the law and social morality are a norm of behavior enshrined in the Constitution, in which criticism is seen as each citizen's right. That is not all. Those who obstruct this -- they are often called, quite mildly in my view, "suppressors of criticism" -- are in defiance of the law. An official at any level can even be sent to trial for that type of action. Our press, radio, and TV may still be unsophisticated but on the whole they provide an extensive and free forum for popular, public opinion.

Question: Various cricles in the West often ask whether the vestiges of Stalinism have been overcome in the Soviet Union.

Answer: "Stalinism" is a concept thought up by the enemies of communism and widely used to discredit the Soviet Union and socialism as a whole.

It has been 30 years since the 20th party congress raised the question of overcoming Stalin's personality cult and adopted the CPSU Central Committee resolution on this question. To put it bluntly, those were difficult decisions for our party. They were a test of party principledness and fidelity to Leninism.

I think that we passed that test worthily and drew the proper conclusions from the past. This concerns the life of the party itself and of Soviet society as a whole. We see the further development of intraparty democracy and socialist democracy in general, the strengthening of the principles of collectivity in work, and the expansion of publicity as our most important tasks. The party and its Central Committee demand modesty from people elected to leadership posts and foster in Communists intolerance of laziness and toadying. We attach and will continue to attach immense importance to guarding and strengthening socialist legality and constantly keeping law enforcement organs under strict control. All these are important avenues of the political work currently being pursued by our party. And this work and our entire life today provide a convincing answer to your question.

Question: What is the effect of the processes currently under way in your country on the state of the USSR's cultural life, which, incidentally, is not well known in the West?

Answer: The West indeed has a very poor knowledge of our cultural life. And, to speak quite frankly, certain people in the West exploit this to simply fill people's heads with falsehoods and distort the genuine state of affairs.

The Soviet Union is currently going through a period of notable upsurge in its culture. Many outstanding writers, poets, composers, artists, and opera, ballet, theater, and movie artistes and directors are our contemporaries. They are outstanding by world standards, not just our own. In our country literature and art have become the property of the immense people's masses, not of cliques of connoisseurs and patrons. The Soviet Union produces print runs unprecedented anywhere else in the world of classic and contemporary poetry and prose -- both Soviet and foreign, including French, of course. But probably that most remarkable phenomenon in our cultural life is the extensive development of the people's artistic creativity.

In this regard I think that the changes taking place in our society's life will undoubtedly affect and benefit Soviet culture.

We have everything necessary to ensure its further speedy development and its comprehensive flourishing: the educational standard of the broad masses, the beautiful traditions of profound respect for, interest in, and attraction to spiritual values, the access to the entire wealth and diversity of our country's multinational culture, and, finally party policy, which considers the development of society's spiritual life to be one of its highest-priority tasks. We are now even thinking

of considerably strengthening the material base of culture and the entire spiritual sphere.

Question: May we now move on to international questions. Could the U.S. "star wars" plans lead to war? Have you noticed any new signs of the restoration of detente in international relations since the Geneva summit?

Answer: You have asked two questions at once.

The first is about the U.S. "star wars" program. We are profoundly convinced that this program really increases the threat of war and at a certain stage may make it probable. I have often spoken -- and in sufficient detail -- about the foundations of that argument. I would like to devote attention to just one aspect of the problem. Although the planned implementation of the entire "star wars" venture is decades away and only a handful of "enthusiasts" believe in its implementation, if the United States persists in the matter it will have serious consequences in the very near future. The point is that, in implementing the "star wars" program, Washington is in essence consciously aiming to wreck the talks that are currently under way and annul all existing arms limitation agreements. Were this to happen, the USSR and the United States, their allies, and the entire world would find themselves in the next few years in a situation of an absolutely uncontrolled arms race, strategic chaos, a highly dangerous undermining of stability, and universal uneasiness and fear with a concomitant increased risk of catastrophe. This, I repeat, is a danger that threatens not just our grandchildren but us ourselves all of us, all mankind.

Why take this risk? I concede that President Reagan personally believes in the "salvation" mission of "star wars." But if the whole point is to put an end to the nuclear threat, why does the United States not agree in principle with the USSR's recent proposals: They provide for a far shorter, more direct, cheaper, and, the main thing, safer path toward the elimination of the nuclear threat -- the total elimination of nuclear weapons. I emphasize -- a safer path. After all, the path the United States is now proposing toward this goal is hopeless. Despite the assertions of the champions of "star wars," nuclear weapons will simply not have time to "grow obsolete," on the contrary, they will be improved. And matters may reach the point where they become so complex that decisions have to be assigned entirely to computers, to automata. Human civilization will thus be made the hostage of machines and therefore of technical errors and breakdowns. How dangerous this is was shown once again by the recent tragedy with the U.S. space ship Challenger -- a reliable space ship which had been repeatedly tested and checked within the limits to which this is generally possible today.

I am sure that Washington is also well aware of this and that over there for each "believer" in this surreal plan to get rid of the nuclear threat there are at least 10 cynics who have in mind something quite different from what President Reagan is obviously talking and dreaming about. For instance, some people, realizing that you cannot create an "impenetrable shield," are prepared for less, for a limited ABM defense which in combination with preventive strike means against the other side's forces of retaliation would create the possibility of carrying out nuclear aggression with impunity. Others simply want to make a profit. Others, by dragging the USSR into the space race, want to undermine its economy. Others want to increase the United States' technical lead over Western Europe and thus ensure the latter's dependence... Well, and so on.

So the question of "star wars" is a very broad question. Here it is not only two views of this specific program but also two approaches, two concepts of security which have clashed. The U.S. concept is the concept of safeguarding security primarily through military-technical means, in this case through a new "superweapon," through a technical focus which would help find a way out of the nuclear impasse.

Here, despite the very vague, absurdly implausible talk about being ready "when the time comes" to share the "miracle-technology" with other countries (including the USSR) the United States wants to get out of this impasse on its own: to achieve absolute security for itself and to place everyone else in a position of "absolute danger."

The Soviet concept is the concept of safeguarding equal security for all on the path of arms reduction and disarmament, right up to the total elimination of all types of weapons of mass annihilation. Because in our time there can be no security for the USSR without security for the United States, no security for the Warsaw Pact countries without security for the NATO countries. Without their mutual security there can be no universal security.

Answering your question, I want to particularly highlight the problem of Europe's liberation from nuclear weapons, above all the medium-range missiles which are seriously undermining European security. Here, too, we have the right to count on the realism and prudence of British and, of course, French policy.

The champions of nuclear armaments are putting into play the argument that their elimination will leave the West "defenseless" in the face of Soviet "superiority" in so-called conventional armaments. I will not argue right now about whether such "superiority" exists or not. The main thing lies elsewhere -- our proposals provide for the reduction of these armaments as well, as they do for the consolidation of confidence-building measures. We did not come out with the proposal to put an end to nuclear weapons simply to move the arms race to other spheres which with time will become no less dangerous.

We realize that the implementation of our security concept requires tremendous efforts, labor, a persistent struggle, and the breaking of traditions thousands of years old, as I have already said. But the world simply cannot continue to live and act in the old way when the threat of nuclear war is a reality.

Is a world without weapons, a world without wars, possible at all? I would answer this question with another question: Is it conceivable to preserve human civilization by continuing the constantly accelerating arms race, fuelling tension and balancing on what is, so to speak, the constantly narrowing brink of war?

Have there been noticeable signs of the restoration of detente in international relations since the Geneva summit? Here, in my view, we should be cautious in our assessments. Yes, some signs are beginning to appear. It is not only and not so much a case of individual little advances in the field of Soviet-U.S. relations. They are too limited and peripheral and do not affect fundamental questions. On the other hand a certain change in the political atmosphere can already be felt. This has generated among the peoples of many countries hope and faith in the possibility of returning to detente, halting the senseless arms race, and developing normal peaceful international cooperation. This is already something real and politically substantial.

The changing political atmosphere also helps us, helps the Soviet Union, to approach the elaboration of new proposals and new initiatives more boldly and resolutely. I am sometimes asked: Can the Soviet Union believe that the present U.S. Administration and the governments of some of the countries that are its allied will agree to the new Soviet proposals? Proposals like the total prohibition of nuclear explosions, the gradual destruction of nuclear weapons in Europe and throughout the world, the prevention of the arms race in space, and so forth, for example?

A natural question. But a policy, particularly in the nuclear age, cannot be built on the basis of the principle of trusting your partner completely or not at all.

A policy must be built on real foundations, taking into account the distribution of forces in the international arena, the requirements of the time, and the interests of one's own people, of other peoples, and of world peace. Since that is so, the Soviet Union, as a socialist state, simply has to propose to the world a radical and at the same time realistic alternative to nuclear war which considers the interests of all peoples, a program for resolving the problems facing mankind. These proposals are a kind of "moment of truth." They make our partners in the talks shows their real worth and reveal the aims their policy is really pursuing. When we proposed a moratorium on nuclear weapon explosions, we were told: See here, you schemers, you carried out more tests this year (that was not true even then, incidentally) and now you are suggesting that the United States stop. For the 7th month now we have carried out no tests. Now even the United States cannot use that pretext. Now they have begun to speak of verification [kontrol] and inspection [proverka]. We expressed the readiness for any inspection [proverka] measures. That pretext disappeared as well. What remains? Is it not only the U.S. determination to continue the arms race come what may?

The "Decree on Peace" written by V.I. Lenin (it was, by the way, the new-born Soviet Government's very first decree) expressed the firm intention of the first socialist state in history to pursue policy and to act "...openly in front of the entire people," to address its proposals to "governments and peoples," and to "help the peoples to intervene in questions of war and peace." "We will struggle," Lenin said when presenting the draft of that decree to the Congress of Soviets, "against the deceitfulness of governments which talk constantly about peace and justice while in reality waging predatory, annexationist wars." At the same time, with the Soviet Land's relations with the capitalist powers in mind, he also said: "We dare not and we must not allow governments to hide behind our obduracy and to conceal from the peoples why they are being sent to the slaughter... Our enemies use ultimatums to ease their own positions. We, however, show the people all the conditions. We confront all governments with our terms, and they have to answer to their own peoples."

That is the principled, communist statement of the question. I have not recalled these words of Lenin, these Leninist principles by chance. There is a profound similarity between the situations then and now. In 1917, at the height of World War I, the main question was: How could the bloodshed imposed on the peoples by the imperialist governments be ended any sooner? V.I. Lenin and the party determined that the most effective way was to appeal not just to the governments but also to the peoples. Today the world's peoples have been drawn into an arms race and a nuclear rivalry which threatens even more dreadful slaughter. So naturally, as we work persistently and painstakingly with the Western government on resolving these problems, we constantly also turn to the peoples and address our policy to them.

Question: Are there grounds for expecting an end to the war in Afghanistan in the immediate future and consequently the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country?

Answer: We would very much like that and we will strive to achieve it as far as lies in our power. As we know, the Government of Afghanistan adheres to the same position. It is ready to go a long way down the path of settling the complex problems of the country's internal development and is active in involving a variety of political forces, both in the center and in the provinces, including representatives of the tribes, the clergy, the intelligentsia, and the business circles, in getting life back to normal.

At the same time, not everything here depends on the Government of Afghanistan. That conflict, which in fact developed as a result of outside interference, involves external forces interested in prolonging and expanding it -- namely Pakistan and the United States. West Europe is also capable of influencing the course of events.

I believe that if people there soberly assessed the situation in and around Afghanistan and also, of course, weighed their own interests and the interests of world peace, ways of helping to resolve the problem would be found.

Question: Can Soviet-French relations be improved, and what needs to be done to achieve that?

Answer: Of course they can. I would even say that they ought to be improved. The Soviet Union stands for broad cooperation with France and for friendship between the Soviet and French peoples. The differences [razlichiya] between the Soviet Union and France are no barrier whatever to accord and cooperation between them. That is our firm, long-standing, principled position. We consider the improvement of mutual understanding and the establishment of cooperation between the USSR and France important to our countries' fundamental interest -- strengthening peace in Europe and throughout the world and normalizing the international situation.

Giving renewed impetus to Soviet-French relations was in fact the point of the summit in Paris last fall. We have succeeded in achieving something in the recent period. But from our viewpoint great unused potential still remains. We would like to be able to count on our countries' being active partners in resolving problems on the historic scale such as curbing the arms race, completely eliminating nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons, and preventing the creation of space strike armaments.

With their great scientific-technical and intellectual potential and their experience of good relations, the Soviet Union and France could set a good example in the sphere of cooperation in the science and technology sphere. In addition to further developing trade and economic relations this could, incidentally, help to resolve the problem of employment in France to a certain extent.

It has turned out historically that Soviet-French relations have traditionally relied on the two peoples' sympathy and respect for one another. So we find it all the harder to understand the persistent desire now being shown by certain circles in your country to provoke among French people hostility to and mistrust of the Soviet Union and to create a false image of our country and its policy. We are grateful to the French Communists and to L'HUMANITE for opposing anti-Sovietism and for telling the truth about the Soviet Union and socialism. We regard this as an important form of PCF solidarity with our party.

What makes the communist movement strong is precisely such solidarity -- solidarity in deed -- among all its constituent parties, equal, independent, working under different conditions, and resolving different tasks, united in the common struggle for the interests of the working people's masses and for peace and socialism.

In conclusion, I would like to convey cordial greetings and good wishes to L'HUMANITE readers, the French Communists, and all French working people. [answer ends]

During the handing over of the text of the answers to the French comrades a conversation was held between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Leroy which proceeded in a cordial, comradely atmosphere.

R. Leroy: I want to thank you for answering our questions so directly and frankly. The topics touched on in them are of great interest to French people, who are short of objective information. I have to note, unfortunately, that the majority of the French mass media currently pursue a sharply anti-Soviet line.

M.S. Corbachev: In contacts with us, the representatives of different circles in France, including the president, declare the traditionally friendly character of our relations and the fact that their roots go back into history. They stress here the desire to preserve such relations and add new content to them. That is our position as well. We favor maintaining the traditionally friendly ties with France, and we do everything in our power to develop good Soviet-French relations. Against the backdrop of all this it is hard for us to understand why the unfriendly campaign against the USSR has assumed such an extensive scale in France.

Or take, for example, something like the recent expulsion from France of several more Soviet Embassy personnel, citing their supposed pursuit of unlawful activity. Once again the specter of "Soviet spies" is stalking France. Of course, this is a totally groundless action undertaken on an invented pretext. Suffice it to say, for example, that one of those accused of "unlawful contacts" is a technical assistant who worked exclusively inside the embassy building, had no contacts with foreigners, and does not even know a foreign language. All this is bound to cause bewilderment. What political calculation is behind it all? What are the reasons for it -- are they to do with internal politics, or something else?

As I have already said in conversations with President Mitterrand, we sincerely want to really inject greater dynamism into Soviet-French relations and to cooperate with France, with its people, and with its political forces on questions of mutual interest to both our countries. But that does not mean that we will not react to unfriendly actions against our country. So, in this particular case, we had to take adequate retaliatory measures.

It would be wrong to think that the Soviet Union is more interested in good relations with France than France is in good relations with the Soviet Union. I believe that both countries have a mutual interest in preserving and developing good relations with one another.

R. Leroy: It is clear that the French people have a particular interest in rapprochement and cooperation with the Soviet Union.

M.S. Gorbachev: In implementing our foreign policy we always take into account the interests of France and its people. This is evidenced again by our latest proposals, advanced in my statement of 15 January.

We consider it natural, by the way, that we should take account when formulating our proposals of the legitimate interests not only of France but also, say, of such a partner of ours as the United States, otherwise such proposals would not be realistic.

I have told President Mitterrand in conversations with him, and I want to repeat now, that we have not the slightest intention of damaging the security of France. In our recent proposals we proceed from the premise that France, like Britain, will join the process of nuclear disarmament only when the United States and the Soviet Union make [osushchestvyat] significant reductions in nuclear weapons. For now we would like to be able to count on France and Britain not boosting their nuclear strength further in the period of reduction of the U.S. and Soviet weapons arsenals.

R. Leroy: We are following with interest the preparations for your party's 27th congress.

M.S. Gorbachev: At our congress we will demonstrate in detail how we intend to reveal socialism's possibilities more deeply in our country and realize its inherent potential. I believe that this will constitute our contribution to Communists' common struggle for a better and a just society.

In foreign policy we will continue to act vigorously to defend the cause of lasting peace and to strive for the destruction of nuclear weapons on earth. This, of course, is very important also in the sense of characterizing socialism's firm adherence to the cause of peace.

MARCHUK MEETS METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERS

LD080546 Moscow TASS in English 0051 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 7 TASS -- Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Chairman of the U.S.S.R. State Committee for Science and Technology Guriy Marchuk met President of the World Meteorological Organisation Roman Kintanar and members of the bureau of the WMO Executive Committee to discuss further cooperation in climatic studies conducted under the WMO international programme.

NATO MANEUVERS OFF SARDINIA 'NEW SHOW OF FORCE'

LD101004 Moscow TASS in English 0837 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Rome, February 10 TASS -- TASS correspondent Viktor Solomin reports:

The vast area around the Teulada Cape on the southernmost fringe of Italy's Sardinia Island has been converted into a huge "battlefield". The North Atlantic bloc began week-long large-scale maneouvres there.

The new show of force by the NATO military was received with deep worry by Italy's democratic public. The fact that these military games are staged in immediate proximity to Africa's shores, at the point when the situation in the Mediterranean area has sharply aggravated and U.S. threats and provocations against Libya continue unabated has sparked off particular alarm. It is not by chance, it is pointed out here, that [words indistinct]

In their strategic plans the Pentagon and NATO allot a major place to Sardinia, whose militarization escalated into formidable proportions, the newspaper "UNITA" writes. According to official figures, cited by the newspaper, military exercises on the Teulada Cape are held for the duration of eleven and a half months a year. Local peasants are driven out of their lands and fishermen are banned from fishing in coastal areas. Close to 22,000 hectares of the island are now under the authority of the military which set up various bases and shooting ranges there.

We have been waging the struggle against Sardinia's militarization for a long time now, said communist Luigi Cogodi, a member of Sardinia's regional junta (local executive body of government). He said that the presence of the military on the island is in glaring conflict with the clauses of the national constitution. For instance, work began several weeks ago amid tight secrecy to enlarge a military facility on the Santo-Stefano Island (the Maddalena Archipelago, near Sardinia), the cite of the large-scale U.S. naval base to service nuclear-powered submarines. It was only due to the energetic interference by the regional government that Defence Minister Giovanni Spadolini issued an instruction to suspend the work. Cogodi said that the regional council (legislative government body) would discuss in-depth the issue of the presence of the military on the island in the next few days.

MORE REPORTS ON SENATOR KENNEDY'S MOSCOW VISIT

Kennedy Speaks on Moscow TV

LD091902 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1610 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Statement by Senator Edward Kennedy on 7 February prior to his departure from Moscow; place not given; recorded in English fading into superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] I have come to the Soviet Union at a time of sorrow for my country. Last week we lost seven astronauts, who were brave explorers of the dangerous ocean of space. We are grateful to the Soviet Government and to the Soviet people for their sympathy and condolences, and, like you, we are fully determined to continue work on one of the greatest tasks confronting mankind.

I also came to the Soviet Union at a heartening time for relations between our countries. A meeting took place between the leaders of our two states, and for the first time of late, from this height, we saw hope of a better future.

There are many fields which continue to divide as before. This will also be the case in the future too, but there are also links of memory and history which bring us close together. American families like Soviet families knew the burden of the great war, in which our peoples fought side by side. One of the clearest memories of my childhood were the sorrowful times, which affected the whole of my family, too. My brother Joe was a fighter pilot and died during a dangerous operation over the English Channel. My sister's husband Billy was killed during the liberation of France. My brother Jack, who later became President of the United States, was almost killed. He was a lieutenant in the Navy.

President Kennedy deeply understood the scale of sacrifice made by the Soviet people during the war. In the speech which led to the conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear tests in 1963, the first treaty which broke the ice of the cold war, he told his fellow countrymen; no other country in the history of war has ever suffered as the Soviet Union suffered during World War II. At least 20 million people died. Countless millions of homes and villages were burnt and destroyed. President Kennedy reckoned highly the courage of the Soviet people, and recalled that our two great countries had never been at war with each other. Thank God, those words are still valid now, 23 years later.

The Soviet Union and the United States have gone through times of tensions and confrontation, have come to dead ends at the talks table. But we have never crossed the line beyond which war is able to destroy the whole of mankind. The greatest task of our time, the greatest responsibility of all time, is the defense and preservation of peace, when the possibility of the end of mankind exists if at the push of a button missiles are launched and there is a nuclear explosion. Both countries must spend less time on preparations for nuclear war and more time on preventing it. Even now our nuclear arsenals contain the equivalent of 3 million bombs such as that dropped on Hiroshima. This is four tons of TNT for every person on the planet, including children.

Neither of our countries can permit itself to chase after the phantom of nuclear superiority, for if we do, the world will be drained, and finally impoverished. For the American people and the Soviet people the concept of national security contains the idea of the quality of their society and the quantity of our arsenals. Every new missile silo means fewer houses for our families. Instead of competing against each other for the number of bombs and warheads we have and the amount of money we spend on military ends, which leads to an increase in the instruments for waging war, let us compete, and where possible cooperate, in guaranteeing peace.

A year ago, on a high mountain plateau in the Ethiopian desert, I saw Soviet trucks carrying American grain for the starving. None of the victims was interested in whether there was a red star on the trucks or the stars and stripes on the bags of grain. In that brief moment, in that terrible place, I saw what could happen if our two countries acted for the sake of common aims instead of reacting to each other with their usual hostility.

This does not mean that all our differences can now be overcome. Perhaps that will never happen. We will stand in contradiction to each other for a long time to come, in philosophy, in economics, in our understanding of human rights. We will assert our views. We will argue about them, but I hope it will always be peacefully. At the same time we must seek new ways to solve old antagonisms and the continuing regional conflicts: in Central America, South Africa, and Afghanistan. Too many mothers in our two countries have seen how their sons, the pride of our nations, have returned home in their coffins.

Above all we must not allow regional conflicts to become the start of global war. We must not interpret our inevitable differences in such a way that they undermine our incontestable common goal -- the insistant requirement for nuclear arms control. We cannot have a world which ensures survival unless we follow the ideal of President Kennedy, who saw the world in its diversity.

I think that the leaders of the two countries understand that truth now. I think that General Secretary Gorbachev is ready for talks on real reduction in nuclear arms. He has said that in a nuclear war there can be no victors. I think that President Reagan is also ready to agree with this, because, as he has said, that nuclear war cannot be won and must not be started.

Before I left I had a meeting with Reagan, and he stressed the importance that he attaches to success at the Geneva talks. The task of the Geneva talks is to translate lofty intentions into great deeds and to discuss one point after another patiently -- despite the profound differences -- and persistently, despite the existing feeling of danger. We must remain at the negotiating table until we reach agreement. The possibilities exist for reaching agreement even on the most complex problem, where the differences are the most evident; that is, on the question of President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. For my part, I have stated publicly that I am against the militarization of space. But in fairness let me remind you that President Reagan sees in SDI a way of making nuclear weapons unnecessary and nuclear war impossible. General Secretary Gorbachev sees it as the latest offensive weaponry providing both a shield and the means of dealing a first strike. However, both President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev have spoken of the fact that they wish to see a world without nuclear wars. In order to turn this dream into a reality, both sides must seek a compromise, which could cut the Gordian knot at negotiations.

Neither of the sides can permit itself, by becoming entangled in this problem, to lose the opportunity now existing to limit nuclear arms and avert a first strike from any side, whether from the ground or from the sky. We can barely imagine the scale of the threat that now exists. Both our countries are flooded with weapons that could bring more death and suffering than any conflict in the past. The greatest works of human genius could be reduced to ashes by mankind's most terrible work of creation.

In short, we are walking on the knife edge of nuclear confrontation, barely able to maintain an unstable equilibrium: slipping and then holding on only at the last second. Despite all our bombs and missiles, we are standing essentially unarmed on the stage which may be destroyed in a single second. We live with this every day, but it is impossible to live like this forever.

Our generation has in its hands the most incredible power that has ever been known to mankind. Either we shall conquer the fire, or it will conquer us. Together we shall either continue the book of history, or else we shall close it.

Kennedy, Zorin Discuss Visit

LD091930 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1610 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Conversation between U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy and political observer Valentin Zorin, on 7 February; Kennedy in English with superimposed Russian translation -- recorded]

[Text] [Zorin] Senator, I have listened with interest to your address, and I would like to ask you several question. First of all, I would like to ask you about your impressions of your meeting and conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Kennedy] First of all, I would like to say that the conversation was cordial and friendly. The general secretary gave me the impression of a lively, energetic and knowledgable leader, who clearly understands the importance and significance of attempts to reach agreement on issues of the nuclear arms race, not only with the United States but also with other nuclear powers. He has put forward a very comprehensive program which my government is presently studying and to which it expects to give a response. I think that a real opportunity for progress exists.

I came away from the meeting with the general secretary, as I did from the meeting with the foreign minister, convinced that it is now possible to achieve substantial progress. These issues are very complex; they concern the problem of the national security of both our countries, which is a matter of vital importance. I very much hope that the possibility for a positive solution of them exists.

[Zorin] I would like to say that there exists what I would call a Kennedy family tradition: President John Kennedy, Senator Robert Kennedy and Senator Edward Kennedy are well known as politicians who have favored and do favor arms control. As a representative of this famous family, I would like to ask you something. You have already touched upon it, but I would like you to speak in greater detail about your attitude to the comprehensive program which has now been put forward by the Soviet Union in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the general secretary, and all the more since the Soviet public cannot fail to notice the fact that it will soon be a month since the proposal was made, but no response has yet come from Washington.

[Kennedy] First of all, I am not a member of the executive apparatus. I have been a member of the Senate for 23 years, and I personally consider this proposal constructive. This program concerns the whole set of nuclear relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, and deserves thorough study. A preliminary examination makes it possible for me to convince myself that it contains great possibilities, and inspires great hopes that agreement may be attained, in particular on such a serious problem as medium-range nuclear weapons in Central Europe. In other aspects as well, the program deserves the most attentive study.

For a long time I have supported a treaty on ending nuclear tests; that has been my stance in the U.S. Senate for many years. I remember that President Kennedy considered that the partial agreement on ending nuclear tests which was signed during his presidency was his most important contribution to the cause of peace.

I know that at that time, during the talks, an attempt was begun to achieve accord on the total banning of nuclear tests. Such an agreement was almost reached in 1979 and 1980 between Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva. I was present at those talks. I remain until now an ardent supporter of such an agreement. General Secretary Gorbachev stated that the Soviet Union is energetically coming out in favor of achieving this goal. At present, the United States does not take this stance. But I would like to hope that we will be able to make progress, just as in other spheres of the overall strategic balance, and will adhere to observance of the existing ABM treaty, and that this will not be violated.

[Zorin] The question of the so-called violations was raised many times; it is used by those who, say, are against putting end to testing. But the new proposals of the Soviet Union contain far-reaching proposals on control, very radical proposals, and I think that this makes it easier -- if Washington really has such a desire -- to ban all kinds of nuclear tests. What is your opinion?

[Kennedy] The proposals contained in the recommendations of General Secretary Gorbachev envision the most radical means of control, exceeding all the previous ones. The technological progress in the course of the last few years, as far as calibrating underground nuclear explosions is concerned, makes it reasonable to suggest that both the Soviet Union and the United States can develop systems for evaluating the power of nuclear explosions. If that happens, any opposition to such agreement can be defeated easily. I consider this to be very constructive and important. The main thing I will take with me from the Soviet Union is the opportunity to discuss those issues frankly and constructively. This, in my opinion, reflects the seriousness with which Soviet officials approach these problems. I will undoubtedly take this feeling back home.

[Zorin] What is your personal attitude toward the Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan, particularly, as you are the person who called this initiative "star wars"?

[Kennedy] [laughter] Have you read my article? I have expressed in the United States my opposition to the Strategic Defense Initiative; I talked about this to the general secretary. I am a firm believer in the ABM Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union. In Congress I voted for allocating funds for research in this field. The research in this field, as you well know, is also carried out in the Soviet Union. Each country has to have an opportunity for limited research in the atmosphere, research that does not violate the ABM Treaty. I know that your leadership spoke on this vividly and passionately, including the general secretary. In the United States I will adhere to the same position -- maintaining the ABM treaty.

[Zorin] Senator, I recall the conversation we had together in your office 10 years ago and you...And I remember that you said that the American people were disturbed by problems of its own security. Over these years Washington has spent billions of dollars on defense. What do you think? As a result of this has the American people's security increased? And where do you see the real path toward achieving this security in today's world?

[Kennedy] Well, first of all there has been a considerable buildup in the United States in the field of national security and defense. Frankly speaking I believe that the need to build up conventional armaments did exist. We had to maintain our combat readiness. We have a dual obligation. If an agreement exists limiting the possibility of nuclear conflict then we will not be completely dependent upon nuclear arsenals. If there is a flare-up in some part of the world -- perhaps even an accidental conflict -- or a mistake in interpreting the other side's actions, we have to count exclusively upon nuclear weapons.

So there was a need to increase the reliability of our conventional armaments. I am opposed to some types of weapons which, from my point of view, do not provide sufficient security. I have spoken about this during debates in the U.S. Senate.

[Zorin] It is known that during the year that has just begun there is to be a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. As you are one of the most authoritative political figures in the United States, I would like to ask you what you expect from this meeting?

[Kennedy] I hope that agreement will be reached between our countries on theater nuclear armaments. And I hope that we will return to the issue of a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. I hope that all this will be examined in such a way that we will be able to reach some positive results. I think that now the main problem is to find ways of restraining the arms race. This is consistent with the security interests both of the United States and of the Soviet Union. I think that there is a possibility of this. I also think that everything we agree about will be able to be verified without difficulty by both sides. I think that despite our differences the issues will be resolved. I think it is very important to understand that accords will lead to an improvement in the overall climate.

And another field, too, in which we would be able to agree on cooperation is that of space. A great tragedy took place recently in the United States. You, too, have had tragedies. I think that we will be able to find fields not for competition and militarization in space, but for cooperation. I think that our leaders will think about this.

I think that we might also be able to work together in the field of child vaccination. All prerequisites for this exist. There are 15.5 million children in the world at the present time who are dying before the age of 5 years from diseases that could be prevented. The Soviet Union has made great successes in immunology. I have been speaking to your leading specialists. The daughter of the general secretary is a doctor. She is familiar with the medical side of the vaccination problem. The Soviet Union and the United States could work together successfully in this field. They could compete in a peaceful way in the same of mankind.

[Zorin] And my last question, a personal question, Senator. Tell me, in your life, in politics, are you a pessimist or an optimist?

[Kennedy] I am an eternal optimist. I have been in public life for a long time. The last time I came to the Soviet Union was with my son, Teddy, who has lost a leg as a result of cancer. He is a university graduate and today he even takes part in special skiing competitions. My nephews and nieces are very full of the joy of life.

[Zorin] Is it their intention to take up politics?

[Kennedy] Some of them are, yes. My nephew Joe is running for Congress in Boston -- so far successfully. And one of my nieces is running for Congress in Maryland. We are all glad that they are active in their lives, that they do not stand aside. I hope that they will have an interest in issues affecting the Soviet Union, and that in due course they will make their own contribution to the development of relations between our countries, to the development of mutual understanding. I am very glad to have been a guest on your program. I thank you for the opportunity I have been given to appear in this program today and to talk about things which move me deeply, about things that move your leaders deeply, too.

[Zorin in English] And thank you, senator, for a very interesting conversation, and all the best to you.

Kennedy Departs Moscow

LD071635 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 7 TASS -- American Senator Edward Kennedy left Moscow today. He was staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Parliamentary Group of the USSR.

FURTHER REPORTS ON AFTERMATH OF SHUTTLE EXPLOSION

Implications Explored

PM051611 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Feb 86 p 3

[Own correspondent A. Petruk dispatch under the rubric "We Report Details": "The Challenger Tragedy: Questions Without Answers"]

[Text] New York -- On the same stands near the launching pad at Cape Canaveral where friends and relatives of the departing astronauts sat on the morning of 28 January, 3,000 Kennedy Space Center employees gathered for a ceremony to mourn and honor the memory of the Challenger crew who perished.

Then a helicopter took off into the cloudy skies and headed out to sea where at exactly 1139 hours -- the time of the space shuttle's explosion -- it dropped a wreath containing seven white carnations onto the waves.

A search for wreckage from the shattered Challenger continues day and night in the waters of the Atlantic over an area of several thousand square miles around Cape Canaveral. More than 1.5 tons of twisted metal, control panels, tubing, and electrical equipment have already been recovered from the ocean bed. However, no personal effects or human remains of the astronauts have been found so far.

Until the causes of the disaster are clarified, the three remaining space shuttles -- Columbia, Discovery, and Atlantis -- will be fettered to the earth for an indefinite period. Experts estimate that the investigation could take from 5-12 months.

But will the military agree to wait that long? As THE NEW YORK TIMES noted with reference to the latest Pentagon document entitled "Defense Development Policy," President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] is of "paramount importance" and cannot be suspended or subjected to any budget cuts. And yet, as recently as 30 October 1984 President Reagan put his signature to Joint Resolution No 236 of both houses of the U.S. Congress which stated that "the extension of the arms race into space is not in the interests of any state."

In his statement in connection with the disaster and the U.S. space program, President Reagan said: "We have no secrets, we do everything openly." Facts tell a different story. At least 3 of the 15 flights of the multiple reentry vehicle planned for this year were secret, having been paid for by the Pentagon. As Congressman George Brown said at a press conference after Challenger's destruction, 70 percent of the experiments under the space program pursue military aims.

Might it not happen that as a result of the catastrophe and the need to make up for the time lost during the investigation, the Pentagon, the White House agreement, will "take over" future space flights and transform NASA into one of its departments?

Following the Challenger catastrophe, U.S. concern over the "star wars" program has increased. After all, essentially, SDI will rely on even more complex technology than that used during the space shuttle flights. What if it suddenly fails? Democratic Senator Frank Lautenberg, member of the Senate subcommittee on space, declared that everything that has happened to Challenger raises the question: "are we entitled to believe that the SDI program can go on?"

These misgivings are further corroborated by the preliminary findings of the investigation into the catastrophe.

While the flames engulfed the booster rocket, Challenger's computers were transmitting 3.1 million signals per second in respect of 25,000 parameters to the earth. For the sake of comparison, this information would be sufficient "to write" a 30-volume encyclopaedia in... 40 seconds. When the flame which had developed unexpectedly became clearly visible on the screens of the telemonitors on earth, the computer VDUs, summarizing the information coming in from Challenger were printing out the words: "Flight successful, all systems operating normally." Only when the explosion rang out, did this information stop coming in.

According to experts, the "star wars" program computers are to be approximately 100-times more reliable than those used currently in the "shuttle" program. They are to operate without the slightest hitch during at least 10 years of tests. Is this realistic? Many scientists say: "No."

"One failure in 25 flights -- this is not a very impressive indicator," a DAILY WORLD editorial notes. "Of course, space flights will never be 100 percent safe. This does not mean that we should halt space research. It only intensifies the need to stop the militarization of space. Just imagine what could have happened had there been nuclear weapons on board when Challenger exploded?"

"Space flights and exploration must continue but not for the sake of "perfecting" monstrous means for the mass destruction of mankind. Space flights must enrich our lives by exploring the unknown."

In this context a long article by the well-known U.S. writer and scientist Carl Sagan, published in the latest edition of the weekly PARADE under the title "Let Us Fly To Mars Together" is deeply symbolic. It describes the history of the Soviet-American joint Soyuz-Apollo mission and argues that joint space research and flights to other planets must become the alternative to the "star wars" plans.

"Many decades ago, Mars attracted the attention of the Soviet scientist and pioneer of space exploration Konstantin Tsiolkovskiy and his U.S. colleague Robert Goddard. The rockets which they devised were not designed to destroy life on earth but to convey us to other planets. Are our peoples not obliged to use technology for good rather than evil, bridging the distance to Mars and beyond, for the good of every human being?" -- this is how Carl Sagan poses the main question in his article.

"I would like to write a report about how the U.S. "shuttle" docks with the Soviet "Salyut," how a new international crew is working under a new program for the peaceful exploration of space, how a gigantic space station is being built in orbit where an international interplanetary manned spacecraft is assembled and takes off for Mars and how Soviet and American guys make the first footprints in the red sand of Martian deserts," -- this is a quote from an article published in our newspaper 14 July last year and reproduced in PARADE.

The Challenger catastrophe and Carl Sagan's appeal: they are separated by a gulf termed "star wars." Will it be possible to bridge this gulf? This is another question which clamors for an answer.

Inquiry Linked to Pentagon

PM061023 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Palladin dispatch: "The Challenger Catastrophe: Why They Are in Such a Hurry"]

[Text] Washington -- The NASA leadership is predicting with increasing certainty that the next shuttle program launch may take place as early as June. Right, so the reason for Challenger's loss has finally been revealed, the faults in the assembly of the craft eliminated, and conclusions drawn?

Wrong on all three counts. Although 15 tons of various objects have been recovered here, some human remains found, and a film showing the Challenger launch from the side where the destructive flames were has come to light, no one is able to state categorically that the picture of the catastrophe is clear. All that can be said with certainty is that NASA overestimated the reliability of the solid-fuel boosters and consequently removed their sensors.

Why is it, then, that some people are rushing to resume the flights of the three remaining NASA shuttles? Or is (J. Li) (a leading space hardware specialist), who has called the loss of Challenger a catastrophe unparalleled in human history and who has advocated the most thorough investigation of its causes, mistaken? And surely NASA itself predicted just the other day that an inquiry might take many months, and even years?

I will begin with the fact that on 3 February NASA...was removed from the investigation.

Instead, by presidential decree, a new commission to investigate the circumstances of the loss of Challenger was set up, a commission headed by former U.S. Secretary of State W. Rogers and ex-astronaut N. Armstrong, the first man to set foot on the moon. They have been instructed to submit within 4 months -- to be precise, by June as earlier mentioned -- their ideas on how to avoid similar accidents in the future. There is no question at all of curtailing or at least suspending the shuttle program. Therefore, in light of this and other factors, you are inevitably drawn to conclude that certain circles here are extremely interested in Challenger flights being resumed as quickly as possible.

It is an open secret just who those people are.

Take NASA, whose leadership has for a year now been literally begging for appropriations for its activity, especially if the work affected its civil program. Hence, the strange -- to an outsider -- "outings" on board the shuttle which NASA started arranging from last year on, including nonprofessionals among the astronauts. There is, however, nothing strange about it: It is a typical publicity stunt designed to persuade people that the as-yet essentially "untried" shuttle craft is fully operational.

Naturally, the Pentagon has its own interest in the flights resuming as quickly as possible. The Challenger accident threatens them, according to THE BOSTON GLOBE, with a glut of military spy satellites.

Nor can the White House wait to hear again the shuttle's call signs for outer space: In the next few years the shuttle craft are to become the main means of putting prototype space weapons into orbit. It is clearly no coincidence that THE WASHINGTON TIMES, reading the administration's mind, has assured people that the Challenger catastrophe will in no way affect "star wars" preparations.

Discovery Launch Anticipated

LD082305 Moscow TASS in English 2243 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 9 TASS -- THE WASHINGTON POST reports, quoting congressional sources, that the Pentagon is intensifying preparations for the first launching of the Discovery shuttle spaceship in July this year. According to the newspaper, within the next ten days the Discovery will be shipped from Cape Canaveral to the Vandenberg base for pre-flight tests. The Pentagon insists on the program going ahead despite the fact that the investigation into the Challenger disaster has not yet been finished. Manned spaceships have never been launched from the Vandenberg base.

Cosmonaut Cited

LD081334 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 8 Feb 86

["The Challenger Drama: Worries and Hopes" -- TASS identifier]

[Text] Moscow, February 8 TASS -- TASS news Analyst Nikolay Zheleznov writes:

In the TASS show-case of photographs in Moscow, where usually photographs depicting the main news the world over are changed almost daily, one can see for ten days now the tragic photographs showing the Challenger drama.

One can describe the feelings of people looking at the tragic photographs as those of pain and worry. It is difficult to tear oneself away from the seven smiling faces, the fantastic white cloud of the tragic explosion. Let us make a few steps back and look at the pictures of that tragedy over the shoulders of people who came here to have the last glance of those who are not destined to return back to earth. Old people, women and students are standing their shoulders covered with snow.

"When such a disaster happens, it seems to all earthmen that their common crew perished," said Oleg Makarov, a famous cosmonaut, who four times took part in outer space missions, one of the most experienced engineers of the space equipment design bureau. He has a special right to make such a statement. Eleven years ago his liftoff into the orbit together with Vasiliy Lazarev was dramatically disrupted, but ended happily in the mountains of the Altai due to the timely separation of the descent module from the rocket in disrepair.

"We regret that the world has lost clever and courageous people," Makarov says. "It gives us pain to realize that neither the astronauts nor the Mission Control Centre knew about the plume of fire in one of the booster rockets, and having 13 second for rescue, could not prevent the tragedy. We regret that in two months, when all of us -- the cosmonauts and astronauts of 19 countries will celebrate the 25th anniversary of Yuriy Gagarin's flight, the courageous seven of the Challenger will not be with us.

"That 25th in number launching of the shuttle increased the list of people who made space flights to top 200. But if warning us that it was too early that we have got accustomed to think that the profession of the cosmonaut is a usual one. On January 28 the price paid by mankind for the difficult trials blazed in outer space became twice as heavy. Ten American astronauts and four Soviet cosmonauts died either on their way into outer space or when returning back to earth.

The news of the disaster caused pain in the hearts of the Soviet people. But imagine for a minute, the worker told me when leaving that the "Soyuz" -- "Apollo" mission had been continued. Maybe, there had not been the January tragedy in Cape Canaveral and some of that courageous seven would now be approaching Mars aboard a Soviet-American spaceship.

SAGDEYEV COMMENTS ON SAGAN MARS PROPOSAL

PM061521 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 February 1986 First Edition

[Commentary by Academician R.S. Sagdeyev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Space Research Institute]

[Excerpt] Soviet scientists know Carl Sagan well. Not only is he a prominent planetologist (suffice it to say that C. Sagan was scientific leader of the Viking project), he is also a major public figure who is profoundly concerned about the paths of development of human society, the problems of the unpredictable consequences of nuclear catastrophe (C. Sagan was one of the first to draw attention to the 'nuclear winter' phenomenon), and the danger of an arms race in space.

As an alternative to the 'star wars' program, C. Sagan suggests peaceful cooperation in space by means of the pooling of international efforts for the sake of resolving the most important tasks facing mankind. And there are still many such tasks.

You only have to recall the drought which has hit Africa to realize how many people are still sometimes helpless in the face of the unbridled forces of nature. Of course, the relevant space programs will not help us, for instance, to increase crop yields immediately, but on the basis of such programs it is possible to carry out a thorough global study of climate and understand the mechanism which man could influence in order to control the weather in any part of the globe.

Several similar large-scale projects could be mentioned, projects associated either with the exploitation of the riches of the world's oceans or with the fuller utilization of the land's riches on the basis of research done in outer space. The global nature of such problems, whereby it is necessary to cover the entire surface of our planet, makes it necessary also to involve all the peoples and all countries in resolving them.

On the basis of the broadest international cooperation, the front of utilization of space technology for peaceful purposes will be widened and deepened. Space communications and space navigation could develop to such an extent that it will be possible to speak of global communications and global navigation (both for ships and for planes throughout the globe).

Unfortunately, man has done a good job of spoiling the earth's biosphere. Through the use of extensive space patrolling and special measures on land and sea, mankind could still rectify his blunders so that our descendants in the third millennium do not reproach their ancestors.

As K.E. Tsiolkovskiy predicted, "mankind will not remain on earth forever, first he will timidly penetrate the limits of the atmosphere, then he will conquer the whole of space within the solar system." Six of the solar system's planets have already been subjected to more or less detailed analysis by space vehicles. The secrets of Venus are being clarified (largely by Soviet scientists) and giant planets like Jupiter and Saturn and, very recently, Uranus have ceased to be inaccessible enigmas. All the same, Mars holds a special place in mankind's consciousness. Whereas Venus is the Earth's 'twin,' if only in size (though conditions on Venus are not at all similar to those on Earth), Mars has always been, in people's minds, the place where life is possible outside Earth (or was possible, in the past). In order to confirm this attractive hypothesis or finally refute it, the Viking flights alone are not enough. Mars needs a detailed program of scientific research conducted on its surface and below.

In this connection the studies done by our American colleagues on carrying out a manned expedition to Mars are interesting. Incidentally, the cost of such a project, according to estimates, is half of what it is planned to spend on the SDI program by 1993.

The concrete results of the implementation of such a project would be not only important fundamental scientific results in the study of the planet nearest to us, but also outstanding progress in the technological sphere, which will have wide applications on Earth.

Of course, manned expeditions to Mars are not a project for today, or even tomorrow. Before a manned flight, there must be expenditions using automatic spaceships with a view to developing technical solutions to ensure safety. And in the first stage, research using unmanned space vehicles could produce as much in the way of scientific results, and perhaps even more.

Our experience in preparing projects for research into deep space shows that the implementation of such impressive projects as an expedition to Mars is impossible without international cooperation. The expedition of the Vega space vehicles to study Halley's Comet reaches its culmination in a month's time. The preparation and implementation of this project united the efforts of scientists from dozens of coutries.

The next project to study objects in deep space -- Phobos -- is now in preparation. This project, planned for 1988-1989, is intended to study Mars, its satellite Phobos, the Sun, and interplanetary space, and is being prepared by scientists and specialists from 11 countries, as well as the European Space Agency.

U.S. RESPONSE TO PEACE INITIATIVE AWAITED

LD090043 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Valentin Zorin commentary from the "Moscow Viewpoint" program]

[Excerpts] One of the most acute and major issues today is Washington's reaction to the extremely important proposals made by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on the 15th of last month. The initial reaction of the White House was favorable. President Reagan noted the importance and constructive character of Mikhail Gorbachev's statement. True, this was couched in the most general terms, but the very fact that Washington had this time departed from the, alas, memorable practice of dismissing Soviet proposals out of hand was regarded as a positive fact by the public everywhere, the Soviet Union included.

After the initial reaction of the White House, which I mentioned, there followed a series of highly conflicting statements by various ranking officials of the administration. Their aim was clearly to belittle and distort the Soviet proposals and weaken their tremendous impact on the world public. At the same time there has to this day been no official detailed reply to the Soviet proposals from Washington. Of course, no one in this country has any illusions that the leadership of the Washington Administration will accept all the Soviet proposals without any reservations. It is also perfectly clear to us in Moscow that the issues involved require the most careful study, but a reply that could be considered a beginning to a constructive dialogue surely doesn't require a practically month-long study. There are plenty of sufficiently qualified experts in Washington to analyze the problems dealt with by the Soviet Union in its proposals. Hence a careful study of important proposals is one thing and what looks more and more like deliberate procrastination is another. The assumption may well be that time will dull the impression produced by the Soviet initiative and then the whole project can be quietly derailed. But the whole world looks to Washington not to come up with petty stratagems and not to engage in political maneuvering but to furnish a constructive answer befitting the scope and level of the issues at stake.

NEED FOR RECIPROCITY IN RELATIONS STRESSED

LD092355 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Feb 86

[From the 'International Panorama' program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] I would not like to say that everything in Soviet-American relations is frozen and that any shifts since Geneva are so insignificant that they are not worth mentioning. No, there are some shifts [podvizhki], but they are modest. Well, now Leningraders have the opportunity of seeing a fine exhibition obtained from the United States.

In the summer of this year there are to be goodwill games and very soon Aeroflot flights to the United States will be resumed and correspondinly the U.S. Pan American company will fly to our country -- its own planes, of course. And yet all these things which are really on the periphery of our our relations will turn out to be superfluous cosmetics on the state of Soviet-American relations, on the ailing state of these relations, if there is no break-through in the prime thing -- the questions of security, questions of disarmament.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev quite justly said, meeting Senator Kennedy, that a new Soviet-American summit must produce practical results and feature serious moves forward in the most important directions for the cause of peace. Otherwise it would be meaningless. That is a very serious statement.

The Soviet Union has made its choice in favor of peace. And that choice is well-backed and consolidated with practical actions and practical proposals. And of course it is fine that the forces of different political hue, which see and appreciate the broad and open program of action of the Soviet Union directed at liberating mankind from the nuclear threat, are multiplying.

And I would like to end by reminding you of two truths. First: a 100 percent solution of the problems of security of any state, even a strong one, by military technical means, does not exist now. And second: A compromise is possible and necessary. But to reach it one must go half way to meet the other. It is to be hoped that these simple truths will become accessible to today's and tomorrow's U.S. politicians.

KORNILOV EXAMINES U.S. 'NEW GLOBALISM' POLICY

LD071632 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow February 7 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov.

The American Administration has finally shaped its new appraoch to conflicts in the Third World, writes the influential American newspaper LOS ANGELES TIMES. The United States regards it as its right and duty to help the insurgents fighting pro-Communist governments wherever possible -- from Nicaragua to Angola, from Afghanistan to Kampuchea.

There is no need to doubt the paper's revelations: cynical interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. The attempts to suppress revolutionary and liberation movements by sanctions, blockades and interventions, the betting on threats, diktat, and blackmail are the instruments of Washington's imperial strategy.

A conference was held in Washington in January under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Defence on "low-intensity warfare." Addressing the gathering, Pentagon chief Casper Weinberger sought to place the American doctrine of "new globalism" on a sound military-practical foundation by reiterating the U.S. intention to actively use military force against sovereign, above all, small and developing countries.

Now, the President's State of the Union address reaffirms and develops these hegemonistic concepts: Under the pretext of promoting the cause of freedom, Washington states its intention to pursue a policy of diktat and threats, to broaden interference in the affairs of independent states.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces in a report on "U.S. Military Posture, Financial Year 1987" calls for the escalation of American military presence in Europe, in the Middle East, Latin America, Southeast Asia, in the Atlantic and regions of the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

Washington has already allocated more than a billion dollars for an undeclared war against sovereign Afghanistan. The mercenary gangs, knocked together, trained and armed with assistance from the Central Intelligence Agency at 120 camps on Pakistani territory, killed during four years alone (1980-1984) thousands of people, destroyed more than half of schoolhouses, burnt and demolished over 100 hospitals and medical stations. The overall damage inflicted to the country's economy is estimated at nearly 3.4 billion afghanis.

What about the situation around Nicaragua? It is the United States which, by organizing, financing and arming the criminal gangs of "contras" who sow death and destruction in that Central American republic, encroaches on the rights of the Nicaraguan people.

11,000 Nicaraguans have perished in the U.S. undeclared war on Nicaragua. Such is the true essence of the policy of the Washington leaders who pay lip-service to "democracy" and "freedom," while inflicting pain and suffering to the people of the sovereign country and denying them even the right to life.

The list of Washington's aggressive, hegemonistic actions against sovereign states is not limited to the attempts to reverse developments in Afghanistan and Nicaragua with the help of force. Among them are the occupation of independent Grenada, the action which Fidel Castro aptly described as a dramatic example of a return to the "big stick" policy.

More: The attempts to establish American Domination in the Middle East with the help of Zionist storm troops, cooperation with the South African racists who are encouraged to armed attacks against neighbours, operations of Pol Pot men inside Kampuchean territory.

According to the American press, the number of "special operations" conducted by the CIA increased at least five times under the Republican administration.

Claiming the right to be the master of other peoples' destiny, to dictate their will to all and everyone. The Washington advocates of the policy of "new globalism" are mounting power pressure in all directions. This is an unlawful policy that runs counter to the basic principles of inter-state relations endorsed in the U.N. Charter.

According to the "logic" of the policy-makers, even overt international terrorism, once it is inspired by the United States, should be regarded not as terrorism but as... "Defence of freedom."

Indeed, infinite is the hypocrisy of those who, having institutionalized terror and diktat, would like to look at the planet not as a community of sovereign, independent states whose peoples have the right to shape their own future, but as a "sphere of American vital interests" under Washington's control.

SPEECH EXPOSES WEINBERGER'S 'EVIL IDEAS'

PM071417 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Feb 86 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Valentin Falin "Political Observer's Opinion": "C. Weinberger's Revelations"]

[Text] Even foul deeds must have some motivation, or, as they used to say sometimes, a touch of bravado. It is difficult to manage without them, especially in activities which are thoroughly bad and for which, in all conscience, there can be no justification. But what if, instead of conscience, there are exceptional criteria placing a person or a country on an unattainable pedestal?

In mid-January C. Weinberger was the main speaker at a conference on problems pertaining to "low intensity conflicts," which was held at the National Defense University in Washington. U.S. militarism is searching for its identity in an unpopular, anachronistic, and odious role. It has strength in abundance. The only thing lacking is the "theoretical framework." The secretary was expected to provide revelations, and the audience appeared not to be disappointed.

Here are a few key theses from Weinberger's speech. They faithfully convey the tenor of the entire conference, the thinking of those who steer the U.S. military machine, who have divided up the world, every inch of it, into sectors for adventures of varying intensity.

In the event of complications in a particular region or individual country, C. Weinberger stated, "we must decide whether our interests require interference. We must decide whether the country's leadership is capable of using our assistance for the proper purposes, namely, to safeguard security and the people's well-being, and not just to hold on to power and consolidate the corrupt practices which caused the country's problems in the first place. We must decide whether the country's existing leadership is better or worse for its people than potential alternative leaderships. We cannot allow our animosity toward imperfect regimes to result in much worse alternatives.

"We must decide whatform the interference is to take if we decide to interfere and what methods and what organs to use. If our interference is justified we must be prepared to act alone."

We will break off at that point. Clearly, the material did not inspire the Pentagon chief to elegant oratory. A few sentences, and there you have a whole concept. And look how it is expressed! Each word pronounced clearly and with relish. Step-by-step escalation. You stand on the first step and the rest is automatic.

The United States is not under attack. It is not being threatened. U.S. citizens are not under pressure and their capital is not being encroached on. It is just that internal events have taken place somewhere, perhaps far away across the sea, and Washington is in a spin, wondering whether or not to interfere. and if it does interfere, on what pretext. Think it over and decide whether the country's current leadership should remain, in the interests of the people, of course. If it decides to interfere, then how. You will not find a better illustration of Reagan's "program of democracy and public diplomacy." "Democracy" in its absolute form, implicit in the formula: "We (the United States) will decide" or, by way of variety, that is to say, "pluralism," -- "must decide."

"From time to time," Weinberger continued, "we have unfortunately shown a tendency to consider it necessary to make any efforts in defense of freedom in the international arena multilateral, as if our opinions have to be confirmed by others before we can trust them ourselves...

"There are circumstances where it is necessary to use force in response to low-intensity conflicts. It is important to understand the role of the Armed Forces and the role of other retaliatory actions and the way they combine...

"We must not allow ourselves to be hypnotized by pledges we have voluntarily made to international organizations whose activity is involved with the peaceful development of countries, so that we aid and abet support for hostile governments via various international financial institutions and UN agencies."

In such cases one says: Any comment would be superfluous. If it were a matter of Weinberger's personal views, that would apply. His obsession is legendary. In fact, you cannot expect any other, human ideas from this person. But the hymn to power and war is being sung by the head of the military department, who has the authority to issue orders to and exhort millions of soldiers and put his own evil ideas of greater or lesser absurdity into warheads for nuclear and nonnuclear missiles. So a few observations are unavoidable.

Weinberger draws a line between "then" and "now." There was a time when the United States to some extent needed the allies' support and the sympathy of public opinion. This need no longer exists. Technology has provided Washington with everything or nearly everything it needs, the secretary believes, to be able to act without glancing from side to side and without having to keep an eye on treaties, charters, and the statutes of international organizations. After all, the United States made its commitments to the United Nations and even to NATO "voluntarily." So since it is master of its own words, it can also divest itself of these commitments.

Membership in the United Nations presupposes renouncing violence and threats of force, except in cases which are clearly described in the organization's statute. The present U.S. leaders will have none of this. "There are circumstances where it is necessary to use force"...irrespective of the norms of international law. As in Grenada, for example. So it is no use getting carried away by legal clauses.

The motto of the special force which will carry out the "low-intensity operations" -- "anything, anytime, anywhere, and anyhow" -- should be the principle, the cornerstone of U.S. policy. We say operations of "low intensity" according to U.S. criteria, because what the United States, given the present scale of the militarist orgy in that country, regards as a light workout is the beginning of the end for other states to whom fate has not been exactly kind.

The glorification of force in politics has never done any good. The power-hungry think it has been a bad day if they have not had the chance to chew someone out, to provoke someone, to snatch something. Wealth begets wealth, force begets force. It is also a way of life, its rationale and bravado. A way of life at someone else's expense, pleasure through someone else's pain. It is an attempt to revive obscurantism, destroy all the constructive experience of an era, and deprive the peoples of a promising future.

PENTAGON WANTS TO 'DISAVOW' SUMMIT AGREEMENT

LD071506 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 7 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

The annual reports by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military position of the United States in the world are issued, as a rule, at a time when the debate on the Pentagon's budget in the U.S. Congress is at its height. And this is not just a mere coincidence. From year to year in their invariable formulas, under the same titles, U.S. generals repeat the same conclusions about the need for a further increase in U.S. spendings on preparations for war, "substantiated" by the cliche warnings about the growing threat of war from the Soviet Union.

When reading several editions of that document, which so strikingly resemble one another, one cannot help feeling that the amendments made to them are determined, in the first place, not by the actual change in the military-political situation in the world, but by the Pentagon's tactical aim for dragging through Congress new military appropriations. Also noteworthy is the fact that in introducing new conclusions, the authors of the report do not always take the trouble of making them logical and consistent.

Thus, in the report which was issued early in February, the Joint Chiefs of Staff apparently set themselves the task of showing in the first place, that it was not in vain that they had spent over the recent five years more than a trillion dollars on preparations for war, and second, convince the congressmen that a 12-percent increase in military appropriations even under the conditions of an enormous budget deficit of the United States is "absolutely indispensible."

Correspondingly, the Pentagon has introduced two changes to its last year's report. Now it says that recently the capability of the United States to wage war has considerably increased as a result of implementation by the United States of a programme for strategic modernisation. At the same time, the Chiefs of Staff have also changed their previous conclusions on a balance of nuclear forces between the USSR and the USA so that the congressmen should not wish in connection with that new conclusion reduce appropriations requested by the Pentagon. Last year's edition said: "In this period of rough nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union, conventional nuclear forces have become increasingly important." In the new edition, the same phrase rings as follows: "In this period of challenge to the nuclear balance between the United States and Soviet Union...."

The chiefs of staff did not even take the trouble to explain who, in their opinion, throws a challenge to the balance of forces, which shaped, what circumstances, facts or events have made them change their conclusion about Soviet-American parity.

One cannot help asking the question whether the Pentagon aspires, apart from influencing the Congress, at the time when the budget is under discussion, also to disavow that part of the joint Soviet-American summit meeting saying that the USSR and the USA "will not seek to achieve military superiority".

REAGAN'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ANALYZED

LD081720 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1554 GMT 7 Feb 86

["A Program of Militarism and Imperial Globalism" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, 6 February. (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

President Ronald Reagan has sent Congress a message on the administration's planned legislative initiatives for the 1987 financial year. This document, pretentiously titled "An Agenda for America for the Future", says that the directions of the administration's legislative initiatives are aimed at defining the United States' course up to the end of the present century.

So what is the course for the foreseeable future proposed in this message to the United States in the spheres of foreign and military policy? Briefly, this course may be characterized as a program of unrestrained militarization and imperial globalism. The foreign policy section of the message begins with the standard mendacious assertions about a "growing Soviet military threat" and with slanderous fabrications to the effect that the peoples of the Soviet Union live in "conditions of cruel dictatorship and absence of democratic freedoms." It then hastily states that the United States "continues to strive for progress on all aspects of its relations with the Soviet Union," that the United States "can progress along the path of improving relations with the Soviet Union and of more constructive working cooperation," and that the United States also seeks a "secure future" by means of agreements which would lead to a lower level of armaments, above all nuclear ones.

However, the message goes on to draw a picture -- in great detail and frankness -- on the real intentions and plans of the administration, which totally reduces such assertions to nothing. It turns out that, in order for the negotiations with the Soviet Union to be productive and successful, the United States must build up its strategic and conventional arms at a furious rate. The message contains the demand that Congress should, without any reservations, approve the administration's budget request for military expenditure which according to draft budget would exceed $320 billion in 1987 and allow this expenditure to build up even further, right up to 1991. The message includes a special place for the administration's resolution to force on the "star wars" program, for which $4.70 billion are requested in the draft budget for the coming financial year alone.

As becomes clear from the further test of the message, the relentless build-up of America's military might is needed by the administration not, as is asserted, in order to facilitate progress in the task of turning back the arms race. It is needed in order to activate still further the policy of imperial globalism and the policy of interference in the affairs of other countries and peoples from Central and South America to Afghanistan and Kampuchea.

The administration, the message says, will work with Congress with a view to determining the most effective measures and ways of giving both moral and material, i.e. military, support for the "freedom fighters." That is what Washington calls the Afghan dushmans, the "contras" by means of whom the United States is attempting to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua, the Pol Pot bandits who are carrying out incursions into Kampuchean territory, cutthroats from the anti-Angolan grouping UNITA [National Union for Total Independence of Angola] whose leader has just been received at the highest level in Washington. To the RSA racialist regime, however, which is carrying out a bloody terror campaign against that country's black population, it is being proposed that it continue "dialogue and talks" with the United States. For kindling local conflicts the course toward widening military aid to all governments, regimes, and groupings which are active on the United States' instructions, is already being consolidated in the draft federal budget.

The newborn globalists are also threatening the socialist countries of Europe, which, according to the perverted imperial logic of the message's authors, exist "artificially" and "illegitimately." For re-carving the map of Europe reactionary forces like the Polish counter-revolution are openly being banked upon. In order to bring pressure to bear in this direction Washington, as is clear from the message, intends to take a whole set of measures -- starting from the build-up of NATO's military might, in particular through continuing the deployment of "Pershing II" and cruise missiles in Western Europe, and ending with the further kindling of a psychological war against the socialist countries of Europe.

Other countries and regions of the world where the administration would like to implant customs which are to the United States' liking on the pretext of the "struggle against terrorism," for which the administration also intends to present the appropriate bills in Congress, also do not escape the message's attention.

The Asian region, in particular, is singled out. Here the resolve is proclaimed to strengthen the military alliance with Japan and also to "expand and deepen cooperation with China," to which, as was announced in Washington recently, the United States intends to start large armaments deliveries.

As regards the administration's legislative initiatives in the sphere of domestic policy which are being planned, here too the administration's words conflict with its deeds. The message speaks a good deal of the fact that the administration will present such bills and will take other steps, which, allegedly, will lead to the flourishing and the well-being even of the poor sections of the population. However, the concrete measures which have already been proposed in the draft budget by the administration, testify to the opposite. According to the draft it is planned to cut further appropriations almost for all programs, including for education -- and this is happening in conditions where, as the message admits, illiteracy in the United States has reached an unprecedented scale -- for aid to poor people of which there are over 30 million in the United States, for benefits to the jobless of which, according to the data of trade unions there are some 15 million in the United States, etc.

On the other hand the administration intends to make a generous gift to big business. Reagan's message points to the administration's resolve to try to get Congress virtually to abolish the existing anti-trust legislation with a view to opening a wide road for the creation of super-large monopolies through the merger of corporations which are already gigantic as it is.

ADM CROWE TESTIMONY TO SENATE PANEL CITED

PM092000 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua "Rejoinder": "That Strange Word 'Parity,' or Admiral Crowe's Strange Ignorance"]

[Text] The U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee has just begun hearings on the Reagan administration's request for military spending in the new fiscal year of 1987. The tone of the hearings has been set by Committee Chairman Barry Goldwater, the well-known "superhawk." He described as "nonsense" the claims that the chief reason for the federal budget deficit is the increase in spending on the arms race, although he himself was forced to admit that "in money terms the size of the military budget has increased over the past 2 decades."

But this first bar of the "military cantata," despite its profound resonance, proved superficial or, let us say, insignificant by comparison with what came later.

Replying to senators' questions, Admiral Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that, in his opinion, "approximate parity persists" between the Soviet and American nuclear forces. On hearing the word "parity," the senators -- both "hawks" and "doves" -- at once took aim at him and swooped. In particular, Senator Levin put this question to the admiral: Why does the new report on the state of the U.S. Armed Forces, prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which he heads, not mention this parity, unlike last year's analogous document? A totally unexpected reply followed:

"I don't know the answer to that question."

So, the state's "first soldier" "does not know" what is contained in the report, which he himself signed, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which he himself heads! Perhaps Adm Crowe wanted to show off his truly Socratic modesty? Remember the ancient Greek sage's claim: "I know only the fact that I know nothing"? I think not. Crowe is splendidly well informed about Soviet-American nuclear parity. But the point is that the word "parity" is now taboo in the Washington corridors of power, and particularly in the Pentagon corridors. For the decipherment of this word upsets all the Reagan administration's premises, which are intended to justify the continued escalation of the arms race. New confirmation of this is provided by the President's State of the Union message, in which he "justifies" the growth of military spending by claiming that the United States has not yet completely caught up with the Soviet Union.

Adm Crowe's incautious mention of "parity" clearly runs counter to that argument. That is why the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff hastened to wrap himself in the toga of ignorance, to be on the safe side. But, as the saying goes, a word is not a sparrow, and you won't catch it once it flies away. Even if a whole flock of "superhawks" headed by the far from insignificant Goldwater sets out in pursuit of it.

REAGAN, WEINBERGER SAY SDI TO CONTINUE

LD081746 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 8 TASS -- Speaking in the city of Alexandria, Virginia, U.S. President Ronald Reagan said: I'll do everything within my power to move forward with research and testing of a high-tech defense system. Work under the "star wars" program, he added, was advancing far more rapidly than envisaged earlier.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger who spoke at the hearings in one of the committees of the House of Representatives which considers a draft of the Pentagon's budget for 1987 fiscal, [year] also said that the United States would implement the SDI program. Simultaneously the defense secretary reiterated that the United States intended to continue the buildup of its nuclear capability and deployment of new types of strategic weapons.

Weinberger said among other things that the Pentagon had no intention of limiting the number of MX intercontinental ballistic missiles to be deployed to fifty, as required by the decision of the U.S. Congress. The secretary said that the Pentagon needed fifty more such missiles. He said that at present the United States had 518 submarine-launched c-4 missiles, four Trident missile submarines and six more such submarines under construction. Weinberger also disclosed that the Pentagon planned to take delivery of 100 new B-1B strategic bombers by the end of the next year.

U.S. LEADERS CRITICIZE NATIONAL DRAFT BUDGET

LD092336 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 9 TASS -- The stand of the U.S. Administration on military spendings remains "tough and inflexible", said James Wright, leader of the Democratic Majority in the U.S. House of Representatives, commenting on the draft national budget for the 1987 fiscal year. The President, Thomas O'Neill, speaker of the House of Representatives, said, is going to slash the budget deficit, while leaving intact the military spendings. Yet, this is simply unattainable.

Senator Alan Dixon described the draft budget as "unfair". The administration, he pointed out among other things, is trying to put onto the shoulders of elderly people an additional burden of spending on medical aid, at a time when medical attendance becomes increasingly expensive from year to year.

The draft budget provides for a three billion dollar cut in appropriations to the education department, said Robert Atwell, chairman of the American Council on Education. Nearly 1.4 million students are deprived of government financial support. It is proposed to cancel the programme for aid to the country's libraries. Such measures are real barbarism as regard the programmes that are vital to the economy of the United States and Americans themselves, R. Atwell stressed.

The administration's budget proposals tabled in Congress will cause general discontent among common people in the United States, believes Arthur Fleming, former chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. It is high time to launch a campaign in defence of poor people.

U.S. CONGRESSMAN URGES PROGRESS ON ARMS TALKS

LD092153 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 9 TASS -- Dante Fascell, Democrat, Florida, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, has urged the U.S. Administration to work for progress at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. Speaking in Congress on Thursday, he said that the administration should make its top priority at this stage the speediest reaching of an agreement with the USSR on a complete and general ban of nuclear weapons testing. As Dante Fascell said, later this month the House of Representatives will vote on a resolution demanding a ban on nuclear testing, which has been co-sponsored by 208 congressmen.

He recalled that earlier voting on that resolution, which was originally planned for October last year, had been postponed at the request of the administration, which said that the adoption of the resolution would "undermine" Washington's stand at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

The legislator pointed out that a ban on nuclear testing is one of the main aspects of the Soviet Union's latest peace proposals. Dante Fascell urged the administration to observe the SALT-2 treaty of 1972 on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile defence systems; to work for a ban on the chemical weapons and also reach agreement with the USSR on the verification and control of observance of the agreements.

MOSCOW RECEPTION MARKS CHINESE NEW YEAR

OW040034 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] The Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society held a reception in Moscow on 3 February for a friendly get-together with the Chinese Embassy personnel in the USSR to celebrate the upcoming Chinese Spring Festival.

Attending the reception were Kapitsa, Soviet deputy minister; Bernov, deputy chairman of the Presidium of The Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries; Academician Tikhvinskiy, Chairman of the Central Council of the Soviet-Chinese friendship Society; Rogachev, chief of the first Far Eastern Department of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other personnel of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and members of the Central Council of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society. On the Chinese side were Li Zewang, Chinese ambassador to the USSR and other personnel.

The atmosphere surrounding the reception was sincere and cordial.

NEW COMPANY FOR SOVIET-CHINESE TRADE SET UP

OW090344 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] (Ozermov), a responsible person of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade, told TRUD reporters that a new trade company in the Soviet Far Eastern city of (Nahodeka) began operating in the beginning of 1986 to handle border trade between the Soviet Union and China.

He pointed out that Soviet-Chinese trade is rapidly developing. After extensive talks in Beijing not long ago, the Soviet and Chinese Government delegations signed a protocol on the volume of trade and payments for 1986. The Soviet Union is to rapidly export machinery, means of communications and transportation, (?ferrous) metals, fertilizers, and lumber to China, while Chinese foreign trade departments are to export traditional esport commodities and light and food industrial products to the Soviet Union.

'TEAM-SPIRIT' EXERCISES CONDEMNED BY USSR, DPRK

TASS Statement

LD081110 Moscow TASS in English 1058 GMT 8 Feb 86

["TASS Statement" - TASS take indentifier; Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 9 February carries an identical version of the following except where noted]

[Text] The decision of the Washington administration and the South Korean authorities has been announced in Seoul to hold in South Korea from February 10 this year joint military exercises code-named "Team Spirit-86." More than 200,000 servicemen of the Seoul Army and of the United States troops will take part in these large-scale exercises, which are to last till mid-April this year. It is planned to use a large number of aircraft, ships, other latest weapons, including nuclear-powered submarines.

The U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit-86" exercises creat a direct threat to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aggravated by the fact that considerable reserves of U.S. nuclear weapons are stockpiled in the south of the Korean Peninsula.

The people and the government of the DPRK are determined to work for detente and reducing the level of military confrontation in Korea's territory, thus ensuring conditions for a peaceful democratic reunification of their homeland. The DPRK Government has recently put forward a proposal that no big military exercises be held on the Korean Peninsula and around it.

This proposal supported by many countries is designed to contribute to a considerable lessening of tensions and strengthening of security in the far eastern region and the Asian Continent as a whole. At the same time, it contains a just warning that it is impossible to continue North-South talks if Washington and Seoul do not give up holding military exercises in the south of the peninsula.

The Soviet Union resolutely condemns the provocative military [PRAVDA substitutes word "militarist"] games of the American and South Korean military in the south of the Korean Peninsula, which undermine the fundamentals of security in the Asian-Pacific region and are fraught with a threat to the DPRK and other peaceable states and universal peace

It is also noteworthy that these demonstrative military actions are held in close proximity to the Soviet far eastern borders and concern the security interests of the USSR.

It is hoped in the USSR that the United States and their partners will be able to evaluate realistically the serious consequences of the further build up of the atmosphere of military hysteria in the south of the Korean Peninsula, heed the voice of the peaceable forces, and give up the attempts at blackmailing anybody by the demonstration of military power. Humanity feels increasingly in favor of detente, disarmament, total elimination already in this century of nuclear and chemical weapons. An essential step on the way towards achieving that global [PRAVDA substitutes word "noble"] aim could be the implementation of the DPRK's proposal on the withdrawal of all types of nuclear weapons from South Korea and the turning of the Korean Peninsula into a zone of peace, nuclear-free zone. It is precisely such an approach that would accord with the interests of a practical consolidation of the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, would contribute to a general improvement of the international situation.

DPRK Statement

LD100720 Moscow TASS in English 0706 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Pyongyang, February 10 TASS -- The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has strongly denounced the militarist machinations by the United States and South Korea as an open challenge to all who favour dialogue and peace in Korea, as an action which grossly violates peace in Asia and throughout the world in a statement, distributed here, by a spokesman for the DPRK Foreign Ministry in connection with the American-South Korean manoeuvres, code-named Team Spirit '86, which begin here today.

"The United States," the statement stresses, "should immediately stop the aggressive show of force and withdraw its troops, alongside nuclear and other deadly weapons, from South Korea."

The document calls on governments, peoples, intenational organizations and all peace-loving forces to actively back the struggle of the Korean people for peace and peaceful unification of Korea.

DPRK Forces on Full Alert

LD101310 Moscow TASS in English 1251 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Pyongyang, February 10 TASS -- In view of the U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit-86" exercises which began today. The supreme commander-in-chief of the Korean People's Army has issued an order to place all military and paramilitary units on full alert. This measure of self-defence has been taken with a view to resolutely foiling any intrigues of the enemy and to reliably defending the motherland, says a report of the supreme commander in chief of the Korean People's Army. The report has been circulated here by the KOREAN CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY.

JAPAN, U.S. INCREASING MILITARY COOPERATION

PM071013 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[V. Voytenko "Military-Political Commentary": "Dangerous Collation"]

[Text] The results of the Japanese-American military consultations held in Honolulu (Haiwaiian Islands) at the end of January have provoked numerous commentaries in the foreign press. And this is no coincidence, for the representatives of the Pentagon and the Japanese National Defense Agency examined as the main issues the question of "coordinating military efforts," building up Japan's armed might, and providing the United States with the latest Japanese technology with a military application.

As the KYODO news agency points out, the consultations in Honolulu demonstrated that it was primarily a question of a division of roles between the U.S. and Japanese Armed Forces in the northwest Pacific.

This division of responsibilities certainly does not mean that the United States intends to renounce its functions as a gendarme in the Asian and Pacific region. The thing is that, as Secretary of State G. Shultz declared, "while urging others to step up their activity, we do not want thereby to lessen our own efforts but to seek greater combined might."

Whereas in previous years Washington spokesmen did not tire of going on about some "weakness" of the Japanese Armed Forces and the need to build them up, this time a different atmosphere reigned at the consultations. Admiral R. Hays, commander, U.S. Armed Forces, Pacific and Indian Oceans, did not hide his satisfaction with the scale of Japan's militarist preparations.

By all accounts, American strategists consider Japan's military strength already sufficient for active involvement in Washington's aggressive policy. Tokyo for its part declares its readiness to support its transatlantic partner in the event of so-called "extraordinary circumstances." At the same time it follows from recent statements that this support will even be provided outside the 1,000-mile zone over which Japan has pledged to establish military control. This fact alone completely demolishes the mutual protestations that the Japanese-American alliance is of a "defensive nature" and, as declared during the consultations, "plays an important role in preserving peace and stability throughout the world."

Preparations for military cooperation are in full swing. The Japanese Navy is preparing to take an active part in the upcoming "Rimpac" and Fleetex" maneuvers. The Japanese side has agreed to the siting of long-range radar installations on Nansei Island. As the press emphasizes, with the help of the new radar stations sited in Japan the Pentagon is seeking to create a ramified network for surveillance of the Soviet Navy.

The collation of a militarist course in Honolulu attests to a new stage of the Japanese-American partnership in the military sphere.

FURTHER REPORTS, COMMENT ON PHILIPPINES ELECTIONS

U.S. 'Blatant Interference'

LD071609 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Aleksandr Redchenko report from Manila]

[Text] Early presidential elections are being held today in the Republic of the Philippines. According to the country's constitution, the head of state is elected for a 6-year term. Taking part in the elections are over 26 million Filipinos. During the stormy election campaign which lasted about 2 months, the fight for the supreme state post was waged mainly between two candidates, the current President of the Republic Ferdinand Marcos, and Corazon Aquino, the widow of the well-known Filipino figure assassinated 2 and 1/2 years ago.

The present presidential elections are being held in a complex, unstable atmosphere. The country is going through serious economic difficulties caused mainly by the crisis in the world capitalist economy. Internal disorders are being deepened by the activity of the multinational corporations which are reducing production or closing down their enterprises altogether, thereby depriving tens of thousands of a means of existence.

Political and public figures in the Philippines and the local press draw special attention to instances of blatant interference in the country's internal affairs on the part of the United States, In Washington they would clearly like to influence the outcome of the presidential elections in the Philippines in their own way and in their own interests. It is precisely with this aim that a group of so-called observers has been sent there, headed by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Commenting on the great-power (?schemings) of Washington, the Filipino paper DAILY EXPRESS noted a few days ago that the United States still regards the sovereign republic as its colony. Such a policy naturally is causing an increase in anti-U.S. feelings in Philippines and for this reason, it is not by chance that many mass demonstrations by Filipinos during the election campaign have been accompanied by demands for an end to the dominance of U.S. imperialism.

U.S. 7th Fleet Ready To Act

LD071140 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 7 Feb 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Aleksandr Levchenko]

[Text] In the Philippines today, extraordinary presidential elections are being held. From the ruling political coalition, the New Society Movement, Ferdinand Marcos and Arturo Tolentino have been nominated for the posts of president and vice president; from the opposition bloc, the United Nationalist Democratic Organization -- its leaders, Corazon Aquino and Salvador Laurel.

Judging from political platforms, the positions of the candidates for the highest state posts differ little from one another. At the same time, reports continue to come in from this region on the concentration of U.S. 7th Fleet ships off the shores of the Philippines. The aircraft carrier Midway and the cruiser Blue Ridge are already there. The United States intends to carry out another demonstration of armed force to exert indirect pressure on the Filipinos during the elections. But it seems that they have not restricted themselves to this alone in the Pentagon.

According to information from Western press agencies, the United States has worked our several variants of a plan for using armed fored in the event of so-called "unforeseen circumstances" occurring in the Philippines.

CIA 'Subversive Activity' Cited

LD071001 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] The Philippines today held presidential elections. The main candidates were Ferdinand Marcos, who has been the head of state for more than 20 years, and Corazon Aquino, the widow of the bourgeois opposition leader killed in 1983.

Political passions ran high during the election campaign, What added to it was the interference of the United States seeking to keep its positions in the Philippines. A group of political leaders headed by Marco's adviser, Leonard Perez, demanded that the United States ambassador, Stephen Bosworth, be sent our of the country. An investigation is going on of CIA subversive activity in the Philippines.

IZVESTIYA Views Campaign

PM081838 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

["On-the-Spot" report by own correspondent I. Kovalev: "The Philippines Votes"]

[Text] Manila -- The inhabitants of the Philippine capiral were out in the streets earlier that usual, at dawn, on 7 February. On presidential election day it is better to go to the polling booth in the cool of the morning, when the temperature has not yet passed the 30 degree mark. The election posters pasted on the walls of buildings are still there: The blue-and-red ones are for Marcos, the yellow-and-green are for Aquino.

It is quiet today. The noisy election campaign ended 2 days ago. There are 4.3. million voters in Manila, a large proportion of the total voting population of the Philippines -- 26 million. The outcome of the election will decide whether Ferdinand Marcos, who has ruled the country for 2 decades, and hes party, the New Society Movement (KBL), remain in power. The vice-presidential candidate is a member of parliament and a former foreign minister, A. Tolentino.

The ruling party is opposed by a bloc of groupings headed by the United National Democratic Organization (UNIDO). The bloc's presidential candidate is Corazon Aquino, widow of the popular opposition figure Benigno Aquino, who was assassinated in 1983, and its vice-presidential candidate is UNIDO leader S. Laurel.

... The Polling booth is in an unfinished apartment on (Okampo) Street in Makati, in the center of Manila. The street is so narrow that two cars can scarcely pass one another. Like hundreds of other similar ones in the capital, it resembles a corridor in a large communal apartment. The adult inhabitants, many of them out of work, spend half the day in the "corridor," and for the children it is the only place to play. Foreign journalists are forbidden by law to approach within 50 meters of polling booths. I talked with voters at a respectful distance from the booth.

"Who are you going to vote for?" I asked an elderly women called Moni de la Cruz.

"For Marcos."

"Why?"

"He has done many good things for us."

The answer was not entirely groundless. Inflation in the country has fallen. In 20 years the number of schoolchildren has nearly doubled and there are three times as many state hospitals. Albeit limited, the agrarian reform has given land to 6.3. million peasants, and from time to time the authorities announce wage raises for various categories of workers and employees.

I had another conversation on (Okampo) Street. Leonardo Velasquez, a clerk in a Manila company, he said that he would be voting for the opposition. He explained his decision as follows" "Twenty years of government by Marcos has been too long. The cost of living is rising and too many people are unable to find work." Velasquez admitted that he had not compared the election platforms of the ruling party and the opposition. However, there is basically little difference between the platforms.

They both declare **their** aim to be the economic revival of the country, which has accumulated foreign debts of $26 billion, and the improvement of the population's well-being. It is noteworthy that both sides regard the strengthening of the positions of private business as one of their paramount tasks. As for their attitude toward the siting of U.S. military bases on Philippine territory, the rivals have pledged to observe all past agreements with Washington effective until 1991. The difference is that the ruling party has not raised the question of the bases' elimination and has merely stated the desirability of the conclusion of a new agreement with Washington which would pay greater heed to the country's sovereignty and its ecominic interests. The opposition is offering a plebiscite on the question of retaining the bases after 1991.

According to local political commentators, F. Marcos has on his side a wealth of political experience and a well-oiled local party machine. The C. Aquino grouping's "trump card" is the Filipinos' desire for change.

And, of course, it has never occurred to the vast majority of the voters, unversed in political matters, what part the United States has played in the election. In recent months Washington has put strong and sometimes crude pressure on the Philippine Government, insisting on early elections on the pretext of the "need to restore democracy." Certain circles in the U.S. Governmant and Congress are casting doubt on the current regime's ability to ocntrol the situation in the country and preserve the United States' privileged positions there. Some people do not like the current prosident's display of independence with regard to Washington. At the same time, some U.S. official spokesmen come out in support of Marcos.

People on the other side of the ocean figure that such tactics will make it possible to preserve the U.S. positions in the Philippines whatever the outcome of the struggle. Incidentally, approximately the same thing is happening here also in the family clans of the major plantation ownwes and industrialists. Some support the KBL, others the opposition. Even the Aquino family has split into two camps. This is a guarantee that the family's financial interests will not suffer, whoever is in power.

Clearly, the business circles will emerge the real winners in the election, whose preliminary results will be announced in 2-3 days.

Shishlin on Elections

LD100026 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 9 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] On 7 February the noise of the political struggle subsided momentarily in the Philippines. Electrified by election speeches, about 26 million Filipinos decided the fate of their country on that day. Now even a single ballot could decide the country's future for the first time after many years of leadership by an authoritarian regime. Transparent boxes were installed at polling stations and voting took place only in daytime hours in order to rule out cheating of any kind. In a word, everything connected with the elections was to take place in the public eye on election day. Of the 29 candidates there were only 2 real claimants for power -- Ferdinand Marcos, president of the country since 1965, and Corazon Aquino, who was never involved in politics before. However, right on the eve of elections she was heading the United Nationalist Democratic Opposition bloc. Three years ago her husband, Benigno Aquino, a former senator, was murdered. He was the most well-known figure among the bourgeois opposition, and consequently he was considered the most dangerous rival in the fight for presidential power. The violent death surrounded his name with a martyr's halo, and the family of Aquino became one of the most popular in the Philippines. Since his death, the political life of the country has become even more tense. And today, there is scarcely a Filipino who is unconcerned about it.

The United States is also not unconcerned with the fate of the Philippines. The Philippines' ties with the United States are close -- traditionally close. This tradition dates back to olden times. In 1904 this archipelago in the Pacific Ocean was seized by enterprising Americans and turned into a United States colony. Prior to this the Filipinos had managed to come under the colonial oppression of Spain, which continued for more than 300 years. The very advantageous strategic position of the archipelago at the cross roads of the route from the Indian Ocean to the Pacific was always amazingly tempting bait for the military. Today, despite the fact that the present age is that of missiles, the significance of the archipelago has not diminished in the least: a unique staging post from one hemisphere to the other; a halting place on the U.S. route to Asia; a connecting valve between the base of Guam on Hawaii in the Pacific Ocean and the base on the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean -- this is what the Philippines are on official Pentagon maps. The United States now has some of its largest bases here; on foreign territory -- the naval base of Subic Bay and the air base of Clark Field. It is here that there are some of the largest stores of nuclear and chemical weapons of the United States abroad. It is difficult to overestimate their importance in U.S. strategists' plans.

The military links are supplemented by economic links. The population of the Philippines is 55 million people, they are hardworking and exceptionally benevolent people. However, U.S. capital renders the majority of them virtually without rights. Some of the largest U.S. monopolies keep the country stubbornly in their power. Branches of them pump huge profits out of the Philippines, and replace it with poverty. The state debt is in excess of $26 billion -- a huge debt for a country of this size. The debt and interest on it are bleeding the country's economy white. The gross national product has decreased by 10 percent over 2 years. However the dictatorship of some of the largest banks, the International Monetary Fund included, is absolute. The Philippines have now received a credit of $3 billion, and some of this money will go toward setting up a special fund for private employers. This fund will grant them credit for buying up state enterprises.

U.S. interference in the internal affairs of the Philippines is revolting, their ultimate goal is to reduce us to the position of a helpless colony which could be led by the nose, the Manila DAILY EXPRESS wrote on the eve of the elections. This is becoming unbearable, virtually all presidential candidates have said, commenting on the U.S. attitude specifically on the current situation and on the country in general. In Washington, however, they say (?disingenuously): We are here because we have been here, and simply because we are here. So it is really, simply, to think in imperial terms, one one might say, about the Philippines in Washington. And to the growing demands, for example from Filipinos to take the military bases from the country, Washington replies: The base will remain on the Philippines for as long as it is in our interests. And so that there could be no doubts about this, a flagship missile cruiser and a pair of the largest aircraft carriers of the U.S. 7th Fleet paid a visit to their Philippines base for election day. All the same, Americans have not been able to conceal their alarm about the future of the country. The first thing that their country gave to the Philippines was an invisible but quite large army of quiet Americans, who landed on all the inhabited islands of the archipelago. All possible rumors, forgeries and bribes are their work. Finally, highly-placed Americans, congressional and State Department delegations and so on and so forth, have arrived as observers of the elections. The Filipinos have christened their descent thus: political intervention. We are absolutely neutral, the White House says. But who will believe this if the Philippines are declared a "sphere of U.S. vital interests" by the selfsame White House.

Furthermore, something else is well-known. On the eve of the national presidential elections, some Filipinos were demanding the annexation of the country by the United States as the 51st state. This movement has found support with Tolentino, who is standing from the ruling party for the post of vice president and is a former foreign affairs minister. However, the Americans are against this. As the 51st state the Philippines is a burden. Much, very much if not everything is being done in the Philippines at Washington's bidding. Incidentally, the decision to hold early presidential elections was made under pressure from Washington. Manila does not conceal this.

As a result of the early elections that have been held, the United States hopes to further strengthen its present and ensure its future in the Philippines. Nevertheless, this country belongs to the Filipinos themselves, and sooner or later, it is precisely they who should be its master.

Vote-Counting Continues

LD092042 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Text] In the Philippines the counting of votes for the presidential elections held on 7 February continues. So far contradictory information is coming in on the positions of the two candidates: The present head of state, Ferdinand Marcos, and the leader of the bourgeois opposition, Corazon Aquino, have announced their own victories, although the results of the voting are known for less than one-third of the constituencies. In this regard Marcos has quoted the results on the voting by the National Commission of the Philippines on elections, while his opponent, Aquino, has quoted the figures published by the organization National Citizens' Movement for Free Elections. A final decision on who has triumphed in the elections should be given by the Philippines National Assembly after all the votes have been counted.

FURTHER ON VISIT OF HUNGARIAN DEFENSE MINISTER

Tours Country

PM092022 Moscow KRAZNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Hungarian Defense Minister's Stay in Soviet Union"]

[Text] Colonel General F. Karpati, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and Hungarian defense minister, who is on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, left on a tour of the country 7 February.

The Hungarian guest was seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union S. F. Akhromeyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Colonel General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; and Soviet Armed Forces generals, admirals, and officers.

S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR, was among the send-off party.

The Hungarian and Soviet state flags were hoisted at the airport and the two countries' national anthems were played.

Coloned General F. Karpati, Hungarian defense minister, accepted the report of the chief of the honor guard and reviewed the Soviet servicemen.

The Hungarian defense minister is being accompanied on his tour of the country by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces.

Colonel General F. Karpati, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and Hungarian defense minister, visited an air unit at Kubinka on 6 February. The Hungarian guest familiarized himself with the combat equipment. Colonel General F. Karpati was met and shown around by Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Forces and USSR deputy defense minister.

In the afternoon Colonel General F. Karpati visisted the Marshal of the Soviet Union R.Y. Malinovskiy Military Academy of Armored Troops. The Hungarian guest familiarized himself with the training and material base and the organization of the training process. He was shown around by Marshal of Armored Troops O.A. Losik, chief of the academy.

The Hungarian defense minister was accompanied by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces.

Visits Belorussia

PM101037 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] Colonel General F. Karpati, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and Hungarian defense minister, in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, has visited Minsk. The guest met with G. C. Bartoshevich, second secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee. Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov and Colonel General V.M. Shuralev, commander of the Red Banner Belorussian Military District, participated in the talk, which passed in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

Talks were also held between the Hungarian defense minister and V.M. Shuralev.

The guest visited the Khatyn memorial complex and laid flowers at the memorial's Eternal Flame.

Departs After Visit

LD082008 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Colonel General Karpati, minister of defense of the Hungarian People's Republic, left the Soviet Union today. He had been on an official friendly visit to our country at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and USSR minister of defense.

Comparison on Gromyko Talks

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on page one of its 7 February Morning Edition carries an item entitled "Talk with the Hungarian Defense Minister," reporting on a meeting between CPSU Politburo member Andrey Gromyko and Hungarian Defense Minister Karpati on 5 February. The IZVESTIYA report has been compared with the Moscow TASS International Russian version published on page F 1 of the 6 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT revealing the following variations:

IZVESTIYA omits the TASS dateline in the first line;

In paragraph one, line two, IZVESTIYA reads "5 February" instead of "today";

In lines four and five, IZVESTIYA omits "who is in the USSR on an official friendly visit;

In the last paragraph, last line, IZVESTIYA reads: ...of all mankind.

The following took part in the conversation: Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; and Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief, Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces.... (supplying additional paragraph)

SILAYEV RECEIVES HUNGARIAN INDUSTRY MINISTER

PM071331 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 86 First Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading "Development of Ties"]

[Text] On 5 February, I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received L. Kapolyi, Hungarian industry minister, at the latter's request during his visit to Moscow and had a friendly conversation with him on questions of further developing economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between Hungary and the Soviet Union.

GDR SENTENCES FRG CITIZENS FOR 'ESPIONAGE'

PM091939 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS Report: "ADN Reports"]

[Text] Berlin, 8 Feb -- ADN reports that a Berlin military tribunal has sentenced FRG citizens A. Buehrer and his wife to 10 and 11 years of imprisonment respectively for espionage. The report says that it was established during the investigation that the Buehrer couple had been agents of the FRG secret service and had for many years actively engaged in military espionage to the detriment of the GDR's interests.

GDR EMBASSY MARKS ANNIVERSARY OF PEOPLE'S ARMY

PM071217 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Feb 85 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "On the Anniversary"]

[Text] On 6 February a press conference was held for Soviet journalists in the GDR Embassy in Moscow on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the GDR National People's Army.

Addressing the conference, Major-General G. Oldenburg, military, naval, and Air Force attache with the GDR Embassy in the USSR, spoke of the stages in the formation of the people's army and the soldiers' successes in combat and political training. He noted that, in close alliance with the fraternal armies of the Warsaw Pact states, members of the National People's Army do everything to ensure peace and security in Europe.

Speaking on the present complex international situation, G. Oldenburg stressed that the SED, the Government, and all the people of the GDR and its Army fully support the foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet State, and also the USSR's new peace initiative set out in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev.

SHEVARDNADZE RECEIVES EGYPTIAN AMBASSADOR 7 FEB

PM091931 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ambassador Received"]

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, received Ambassador Basyuni of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Moscow 7 February, at his request. The ambassador conveyed a verbal message from Eygptain President Mubarak to the Soviet leadership.

During the talk, which took place in a businesslike atmosphere, question of Soviet-Egyptian relations, the situation in the Near East, and the international situation in general were touched on. Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze drew the ambassador's attention to the important foreign policy initiatives set out in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January, stressing that their implementation would lead to radical improvement of the international situation on a long-term and stable basis, which would meet the interests of all states and peoples. As far as Near East affairs are concerned, the Soviet side reaffirmed its principled line of achieving a comprehensive just settlement in this region through collective efforts. In this connection, the need for the immediate convening of an international conference on the Near East, with the participation of all interested parties, including the PLO, was noted.

RYZHKOV HOLDS TALKS WITH KUWAITI OIL MINISTER

PM091934 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talks in the Kremlin"]

[Text] Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on 7 February received Ali al-Khalifah al-Sabah, Kuwaiti minister of oil and industry, in the Kremlin.

In the course of the conversation, which was held in a friendly atmosphere, issues of Soviet-Kuwaiti relations and mutually profitable cooperation, the situation in the Near East, and the current international situation were discussed.

It was stated with satisfaction that relations between the USSR and Kuwait rest on the principles of equality of rights, respect for sovereignty, and noninterference in internal affairs. The desire fo further develop Soviet-Kuwaiti cooperation in the political, economic and cultural fields was also expressed.

Nikolay Ryzhkov drew the interlocutor's attention to the Soviet program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in all places, put forward in the 15 January statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The Kuwaiti side expressed its support for the peace-loving foreign policy course of the USSR, directed at averting a nuclear catastrophe, normalizing the international situation and strengthening peace.

When discussing the situation in the Near East, the sides resolutely condemned the expansionist policy of Israel, which is supported by the imperialist circles of the United States and directed at imposing its military and political dictate on Arabs, involving them in dangerous separatist deals, burying the idea of creating an independent Palestinian state, and blockading the achievement of a just and all-embracing Near East settlement.

The Kuwaiti side expressed its high esteem for the devoted policy line of the Soviet Union in support of the just cause of Arabs, and its constructive principled position concerning Near East affairs.

YEMEN SOCIALIST PARTY PLENUM DISCUSSES POLICY

LD071521 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Aden, February 7 TASS -- A plenum of the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party was held in the capital of Democratic Yemen. Its participants discussed questions of party construction, ideology, economics and foreign policy of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

The plenary meeting elected 'Ali Salim al-Bayd general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party. Salim Salih Muhammad was elected to the new post of deputy general secretary.

The plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party confirmed the inviolability of the peaceful foreign policy course of the PDRY aimed at the consolidation of security and stability in the Middle East, and expressed solidarity with the peoples waging the struggle for national liberation and progress. The plenum expressed support for the Arab Palestinian people waging the struggle for the creation of an independent state under the leadership of the PLO, as well as for the Lebanese and Syrian peoples waging the struggle against the Israeli aggression.

Having condemned the policy of threats, military provocations and state terrorism pursued by the United States and Israel against the Libyan Jamahiriyah, the plenum expressed solidarity with the Libyan people in its struggle for freedom and independence.

The plenum of the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party pointed to the striving of democratic Yemen to develop relations with states on the principles of non-interference in internal affairs and respect for sovereignty. The Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party confirmed the course at the widening of interparty ties with Communist and workers parties.

PDRY SUPREME COUNCIL MEETS, AL-'ATTAS SPEAKS

PM091711 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Session in Aden"]

[Text] Aden, 9 February -- A session of the Supreme People's Council of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen was held in Aden on 8 February. It considered organizational matters. Haydar Abu Bakr al-'Attas was elected chairman of the Supreme People's Council Presidium.

In an address to the people of South Yemen he urged all citizens of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to rally their ranks in order to protect the country and the revolution from any encroachments and stressed that the foreign policy of Democratic Yemen would continue to rest on the principles of peaceful coexistence. Relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will hold a prominent place in the foreign policy of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the chairman of the Supreme People's Council Presidium emphasized.

The session of the Supreme People's Council appointed the members of the new PDRY Government. It is headed by U.S. Numan.

SOVIET MEDICAL, CONSTRUCTION TEAMS ARRIVE IN PDRY

LD081524 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1425 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Aden, 8 Feb (TASS) -- Soviet medical workers and construction specialists have arrived in the capital of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen on an Aeroflot flight. In a report on this, the 14th OCTOBER newspaper stresses that the arrival of this group is a practical expression of the Soviet Union's solidarity and help to the people of South Yemen.

LIBYA PROTESTS U.S. RESUMPTION OF MANEUVERS

LD091636 Moscow TASS in English 1556 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Text] Tripoli, February 9 TASS -- The People's Bureau for External Relations of Libya has issued a statement describing the U.S. decision to resume military manoeuvers in the Mediterranean Sea as a gross violation of all international norms and laws. The U.S. armed presence in the Mediterrannean area itself, which constituted a manifestation of state terrorism, is unlawful, the statement underlines. The task of the peoples in the region is to put an end to this. Under such circumstances, our country reserves the right to defend in every way its security and sovereignty, the Libyan foreign policy department stressed.

The statement also condemns the criminal actions in the Mediterrannean area by the Israeli military which is the vehicle of the U.S. aggressive policy in the Middle East.

SYRIAN COMMUNIST PARTY ISSUES ELECTIONS STATEMENT

LD101013 Moscow TASS in English 1253 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Text] Damascus, February 9 TASS -- On the eve of elections to the top legislative body of the Syrian Arab Republic -- the People's Council, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Syria has issued a statement dealing with this important event in the country's life.

The statement has it that these elections will be held in complex-to-Arab-peoples conditions when U.S. imperialism does everything to establish undivided hegemony in the Middle East, to plunder its natural wealth, to undermine the economies of Arab countries and to deal a blow on the national liberation movement in the region. Washington pursues this course, relying on its strategic ally -- Israel -- which serves as an instrument for the realization of the U.S. plans which are aimed at burying in oblivion the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, at putting through capitulatory versions of a solution to the Middle East problem and at drawing a number of Arab states into separate deals.

SYRIAN AMBASSADOR DEPARTS FROM MOSCOW 2 Feb

PM061627 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Chronicle"]

[Text] Muhammad 'Ali al-Halabi, Syrian ambassador to the USSR, left Moscow 2 February.

PCC CONGRESS ENDS, LIGACHEV CONCLUDES VISIT

Ligachev Visits Biogenetic Center

LD072256 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Special correspondent Valeriy Korzin dispatch from Havana; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The work of the third Cuban Communist Party Congress is nearing its end. Here, a draft of the party's program was unanimously adopted. Some changes were made to the party rules. The congress delegates ratified th basic guidelines for the Republic's economic and social development for the coming years. Great attention was paid to improving the system of managing and planning the economy, with attention being drawn to the fact that the greatest success is possible only on the condition that there is cooperation and coordination of the entire economic activity with the CEMA countries.

Of course, a significant role in this will be played by the latest scientific achievements. This is the Center for Biogenetic Research. This young scientific research collective is developing major directions in genetic engineering, immunoloy, and the creation of fermentations. This morning they were visited by the CPSU delegation. Having familiarized himself in detail with the work of the biogenetic center, Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev remarked on the fundamental importance of cooperation between Cuba and the countries of the social community in the framework of CEMA, especially in such a promising field as biotechnology.

This afternoon the CPSU delegation will take part in the final session of the Third Cuban Communist Party Congress. Because of the difference in time, it will start when it is midnight in Moscow.

Conclusion of Congress Reported

PM081905 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Special correspondents B. Averchenko and P. Bogomolov dispatch: "Under the Banner of Cohesion. The Congress of the Communist Part of the Cuba Ends"]

[Excerpts] Havana, 7 Feb -- The top forums of the fraternal socialist countries' Marxist-Leninist parties always attract great interest within the communist and workers movement and among all the world's revolutionary and progressive forces. This is convincingly borne out again by the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC]. It was attended by around 200 foreign delegations representing communist and workers parties, national liberation movements, socialist parties, and various revolutionary organizations from four of the planet's continents.

This is vivid confirmation of the high prestige enjoyed by the part of Cuban Communists, which implements a policy of internationalism and proletarian cohesion, a policy of peace. From the rostrum of the party congress in Havana the foreign guests congratulated their Cuban friends on their great achievements and wished them new successes.

Unanimously endorsing the domestic and foreign policy of their Communist Party which proceeds shoulder to shoulder with the other fraternal parties of the coummunity countries, the congress participants expressed profound gratitude to the Soviet Union, which is rendering Cuba constant assistance and support. The delegates greeted with satisfaction the statement in F. Castro's report that the exemplary relations with the Soviet Union will remain a great priority in the international activities of the Cuban State and that special attention will continue to be paid to them.

The Cubans gave a fraternal welcome to the CPSU delegation headed by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Comrade Ligachev's report from the congress rostrum describing how Soviet people are creatively preparing for the 27th CPSU Congress and the greetings and wishes of success in the implementation of their creative plans which he conveyed from the Communists of Lenin's motherland, met with a widespread response in the country.

The attention of the congress delegates and guests was focused on questions of the struggle for peace and improving the international situation. Speakers noted that in the current complex situation in the world, energetic and responsible efforts are needed from all states -- large, medium, and small -- in order to ensure the peoples' security and avert a nuclear holocaust. An invaluable role in solving the historic task of achieving lasting peace on earth is played by the new package of Soviet foreign policy initiatives put forward in the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, speakers noted.

With great enthusiasm the congress delegates approved a resolution on the main report delivered by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the PCC Central Committee and president of the Council of State and Ministers. Other documents adopted by the congress include a draft of the PCC Program, the Basic Guidelines for Cuba's Socioeconomic Development in 1986-1990, and a resolution on certain changes in the PCC Statutes. A resolution on foreign policy was adopted unanimously. In this resolution the Cuban Communists welcome the Soviet efforts aimed at preserving peace and changing the development of the international situation for the better. They emphasize the great personal contribution made to the cause of strengthening peace by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and express a high opinion of his statement, which contains a concrete program for eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons and also for preventing the militarization of space.

Castro Remarks at Closing

LD080954 Moscow TASS in English 0933 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Havana, February 8 TASS -- The Third Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba has closed here. It has adopted the draft programme of the Communist Party of Cuba, a resolution on some ammendments to its rules, the guidelines for the socio-economic development of Cuba for 1986-1990, a resolution on the foreign policy of Cuba. The delegates to the congress have heard and approved a report by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, which was delivered by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, president of the Council of State and the Council of Ministers of the Republic.

Speaking of the results of the forum, Fidel Castro pointed out that it had been a convincing demonstration of the monolithic cohesion and unity of the ranks of the Communist Party of Cuba.

The speakers at the congress gave a high appraisal of the efforts of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community directed at preserving peace and preventing a thermonuclear catastrophe. The report, the speeches by the delegates and foreign guests to the congress, and its documents stressed the enormous significance of the new Soviet peace initiatives directed at eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons and preventing the militarisation of outer space, which was spelled out in the recent statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

On the closing day of the congress, a new composition of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, the Political Bureau and Secretariat of the Central Committee were elected in a closed session.

Fidel Castro, an outstanding figure of the international communist and working class movement, has again been elected first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, and Raul Castro -- second secretary.

In his closing speech at the congress Fidel Castro expressed profound gratitude to the foreign guests, who attended the forum. He spoke highly of the support and solidarity, of the all-round aid given by the Soviet Union to the first socialist state in the Western Hemisphere throughout all the 27 years of its existence. We will never forget the role played in history by the Soviet Union, which blazed the trail towards socialism to other peoples, which built the world's first state of the workers and peasants. Fidel Castro strongly criticised U.S. imperialism's aggressive policy vis-a-vis the Cuban revolution, condemned the criminal attempts of the Reagan administration at undermining the socialist system in the republic and stressed that they are dommed to a failure. The only result of Washington's policy of open threats and crude blackmail against Cuba has been a further strengthening of the republic's defence capacity, the speaker said.

Gorbachev Message to Castro

LD091945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 1

[Text] To Comrade Fidel Castro Ruz, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee.

Dear Comrade Fidel Castro:

I was glad to hear that you have been reelected to the high post of first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba. Accept my cordial congratulations on this. Soviet Communists and all Soviet people have followed the work of the Third Congress of your party with great friendly interest. Its decisions open up new prospects for the people of Cuba, who were the first in the Western Hemisphere to construct socialism, courageously defending their revolutionary gains from the encroachments of imperialism.

Our Cuban brothers can be sure of the unfailing solidarity of the Soviet Union with the island of freedom. Soviet-Cuban friendship is indestructible. The fruitful cooperation between our parties and countries on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism grows and strengthens for the good of peace and socialism.

Comrade Fidel Castro, I warmly wis- you, your comrades-in-arms, all Cuban Communists and the people of Fraternal Cuba great successes in your work to implement the decisions of the Third Congress of the party.

Castro Receives CPSU Delegation

LD080938 Moscow TASS in English 0915 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Havana, February 8 TASS -- The CPSU delegation led by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Comittee, who attended the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba, was received by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, president of the Council of State and the Council of Ministers of the Republic.

The meeting proceeded in a cordial, fraternal atmosphere characteristic of the relations between the Soviet Union and Cuba. Taking part in it was Raul Castro, second secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, first vice-president of the Council of State and the Council of Ministers.

On Saturday the CPSU delegation has left for home.

Ligachev-Led Delegation Departs

PM091925 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "CPSU Delegation's Return"]

[Text] Havana, 8 Feb -- The CPSU Delegation headed by Y.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has left here for home. The CPSU delegation comprising N.N. Slyunkov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, and A.M. Korolev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and turner of the Urals S. Ordzhonikidze Heavy Machine-Building Plant, participated in the work of the Third Communist Party of Cuba Congress at the invitation of the PCC Central Committee.

The delegation was seen off at Jose Marti Airport by Raul Castro, member of the Politburo, second secretary of the PCC Central Committee, and first vice president of the republic's Councils of State and Ministers, by Lionel Soto, member of the PCC Central Committee Secretariat and Cuban ambassador to the USSR, and by other officials. The sendoff party included A.S. Kapto, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the Republic of Cuba.

Solomentsev Meets Delegation

LD082141 Moscow TASS in English 2124 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 8 TASS -- The delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union led by Yegor Ligachev, a member of the Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, returned from Havana to Moscow this evening. The delegation attended the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba.

At Moscow airport the delegation was welcomed by Mikhail Solomentsev, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the party Control Committee at the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials. There also was in the welcoming party B.O. Rodiriguez Sanchez, Cuba's charge d'affaires in the USSR.

NEW GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHED IN HAITI

Government Council Formed

LD071452 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Madrid, February 7 TASS -- A national government council was formed in Haiti today. It is headed by General Henry Namphy, EFE news agency reported from Port-au-Prince.

The council took over government functions following the flight of dictator Jean-Claude Duvalier from the country in a C-134 plane of the U.S. Air Force with his family and closest aides to France where the aircraft will make a technical landing.

Besides Gen. Namphy, who was previously the commander of Haiti's land forces, the council comprises one more general, two colonels and two civilians. Telegraph and telephone links between Haiti and the outside world were resumed after the ceremony at which the establishment of the national government council was announced.

Duvalier Evacuated by U.S.

LD071929 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1743 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, 7 Feb (TASS) -- Speakes, the White House spokesman, confirmed at a press-conference here that Duvalier's evacuation from Haiti had been organized by the Reagan administration. At Duvalier's request, Speakes announced, we put an Air Force C-141 aircraft at his disposal. "The governments of the United States and France," he went on to note, "cooperated together on the plan to assist President Duvalier's calm departure from Haiti." Speakes asserted that Washington had helped the dictator to flee purely in order to "ease the transfer of power on Haiti and reduce the probability of bloodshed". Further statements by the White House spokesman, however, left his listeners in no doubt that the United States' main task had been to hastily remove their puppet who had totally discredited himself and to renovate the facade of the Haitian dictatorship.

The UPI news agency also cites a frank admission by C. Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense, who made it clear that the United States had been preparing for an armed invasion of Haiti if further developments there had gone out of control. The United States had been prepared to intervene, he stressed. Moreover, the Pentagon chief added that Washington would have opted for military action of this sort if a "threat" had "arisen" to the lives of Americans there. As one knows, the United States also employed a similar "basis" to justify its brazen invasion of Grenada, subsequently forcing on that country "democracy American-style".

Exercise Pressures Government

LD081502 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 8 TASS -- Addressing students of a college in Virginia state, President Reagan said that after long negotiations U.S. ambassador to Port-au-Prince had convinced Duvalier to leave Haiti. As the AP agency said, U.S. Administration officials had for a long time negotiated with the governments of other countries in order to convince them to grant refuge to the Haitian dictator. Touching upon the relations with the new authorities, the U.S. President said that they will depend on what path Haiti will embark. Observers point out that the big naval exercises which started off the shores of Haiti with the participation of 30 U.S. naval ships are a powerful lever to bring pressure to bear on the new authorities of that Caribbean state.

U.S. Marines 'Ready'

LD072034 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 7 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpts] The bloody dictatorship of the Duvalier family, which governed Haiti for nearly 30 years, has collapsed, and the dictator has fled the country.

This is how Haitian emigres living in Miami, in the United States, greeted this piece of news. Similar scenes of joy are presumably also taking place now in Haiti, although the situation there continues to remain inflamed. [Video shows people dancing in streets at night]

Throughout today we have been receiving various -- at times conflicting -- reports on the situation in Haiti. Finally a report came in saying that this morning the Haitian dictator and members of his family left the country aboard a USAF plane. The U.S. State Department representative who announced this refused to say where Duvalier was headed for. One thing was clear -- the plan of his escape had been elaborated in Washington. The United States even made a plane available to Duvalier.

While the regime in Haiti was going through its agonies, in the U.S. capital they were hastily working out plans for replacing the dictator with candidates more suitable for them. A report was then received saying that a military-civilian council had been formed in Haiti and had taken power. According to AP, it consists of five people, including two civilians; General Henri Namphy, holding the post of the Army chief of staff, has become its head. In a television address he called on the population to remain calm.

According to reports by U..S agencies, the United States is ready to bring its marines into play, should the situation in Haiti get out of control. Washington intends to interfere not because it is troubled by the bloody regime: For 29 years the United States had been supporting it and generously helping the Duvalier family, right up to the last moment. But now the U.S. Administration is worried by something else -- the fact that as a result of the downfall of the bloody dictatorship, people of left-wing persuasion, rejecting U.S. diktat, could come to power. And so another invasion is being contemplated. The United States has experience in such operations, including in Haiti. In 1915, U.S. Marines had already captured the country. You can see film newsreel sequences. The U.S. occupation -- when the United States managed Haiti like its own colony -- lasted for 19 long years. [Video shows archieve footage of U.S. soldiers and sailors in early 20th century uniforms disembarking from a ship, being drilled]

But even after the soldiers were pulled out, Washington's control remained. Today, out of 230 industrial enterprises in Haiti, 150 are fully owned by Americans, and in many others U.S. capital shares with French and West German. While farming the country out to U.S. monopolies, the Duvalier family did not forget about itself. It transferred some 40 percent of all state revenue to personal accounts. The dictator's fortune is estimated at several hundred million dollars, which he has managed to transfer to Swiss banks and he now reckons to continue to bathe in luxury on some Cote d'Azur.

The situation in Haiti remains tense. Power, as a matter of fact, is in the hands of the leaders of the former dictator's crack units. In the CIA's opinion they are the best candidates for Duvalier's successors. But Haitian patriots have other views. According to (Jacques Lucien Bierre), secretary general of the Democratic Union of Haitian Emigres, the Haitian people will not support the U.S.-oriented, so-called military-civilian government.

'Parliament' Dissolved

LD100924 Moscow TASS in English 0750 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Paris, February 10 TASS -- The new authorities of Haiti have announced a dissolution of the country's "parliament". According to a FRANCE PRESS report from Port-au-Prince, a decree on the dissolution of parliament is published in the official publication LE MONITEUR. The parliament included 59 deputies. After the so-called "parliamentary elections" which had been held in 1984 in an atmosphere of terror, falsifications, and vote rigging, they had been virtually a-pointed by Jean-Claude

That electoral farce was attended by observers from Washington who, just like dictator Duvalier, were quite satisfied with the course of the "polling".

Army Mobilized

LD092046 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 9 TASS -- According to the latest reports of foreign news agencies from the Haitian capital, the authorities have ordered army units to suppress mass actions by the population. According to preliminary figures, nearly one hundred people have died over the past few hours in Port-au-Prince. The international airport and all border check points have been closed. Haiti's connection with the rest of the world is maintained only through international telegraph.

Call for Punishment

LD072002 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Paris, February 7 TASS -- Duly Brutus, a spokesman for the Union of Patriotic and Democratic Forces in Haiti, has stressed in an interview with FRANCE PRESSE AGENCY in Paris that "ex-dictator Duvalier must be brought to account for all his crimes against the people." The hands of the Duvalier dynasty members are stained with the blood of 40,000 Haitians, he pointed out. At present, he said, talks are being held with a view to endorsing a programme of the new government, that would reflect the demands of the Haiti population.

According to FRANCE PRESSE, France is the second country after the United States which renders greatest assistance to the Duvalier regime. In 1984 alone, the overall value of aid given by Paris to the dictator topped 40 million francs.

U.S. Role Viewed

LD080056 Moscow TASS in English 0024 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 7 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Nikolay Chigir writes:

The dictatorship of the Duvalier clan that had been in power in Haiti with the blessing of the U.S. ruling circles for nearly 30 years has fallen. The latest events showed that when the country was swept by stormy protests of the people, Haitian "president-for-life" Jean-Claude Duvalier had no other way out but to flee. His American patrons were fully aware of that, and they were compelled to sacrifice the dictator to prevent the further spread of the people's struggle in Haiti. According to news agencies, Washington hastily prepared everything for the departure of its placeman from the political scene of the country and his replacement with a junta that would not be as odious as the Duvalier dictatorial regime, but would still serve obediently the interests of U.S. imperialism.

At first, the implementation of that operation worked out in the U.S. Embassy in the Haitian capital Port-au-Prince, that had been shaping Haiti's home and foreign policies over decades malfunctioned somewhat. A White House spokesman announced a fall of the Duvalier dictatorship a week ago but the Washington official circles, clearly embarrassed, hastened to deny their own reports. It has now become apparent, that they in Washington had announced the planned operation too early. An aircraft of the U.S. Air Force was placed at Duvalier's disposal.

The Ministry of External Relations of France stated that Duvalier has been allowed to arrive in France "before heading for another country". What country? As is known. He has been denied asylum by a number of countries, including Greece, Spain, Switzerland.

It is difficult to predict what turn the events in Haiti will take. It is clear, however, that the United States has no intention to lose control over that Caribbean country. According to the U.S. television company CBS, the White House has even worked out a version of the United States' armed interference in the Haitian internal affairs if the events in that country take a turn objectionable for the United States. In other words, there is a possibility of a recurrence of the so-called "Grenadian version" in an effort to stifle, in full conformity with Washington's doctrine of "neoglobalism", the struggle of the Haitian people for freedom, democracy and independence.

Attempt to 'Pressure' U.S. Influence

LD071512 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] According to news reports the Haitian ruler left the Caribbean island Friday morning to seek refuge abroad. Our observer Yuriy Reshetnikov has prepared this commentary:

Jean-Claude Duvalier, who made himself president for life in 1971, beat a hurried retreat aboard a United States Air Force plane provided at his request. Under a deal with the United States and other countries the impoverished island nation is to be ruled by a new civilian military junta. This coup was apparently stage-managed by Washington so as to take the heat out of the massive protest movement that has engulfed the nation recently. The ouster of the Haitian ruler by a less hideous regime would help preserve United States' influence in that country.

Meanwhile, according to United States Secretary of State George Shultz it appears that the United States has always favored a government in Haiti put there, you see, by the democratic process. And yet, up until the Duvalier regime collapsed, Washington seemed strangely unconcerned about what was taking place in that country and was obviously inclined to help the Haitian tyranny to have its way. For nearly 30 years Washington has condoned the reign of terror perpetrated initially by Francois Duvalier and later continued by his successor and son Jean-Claude.

It is with United States connivance that the Duvalier tyranny subjected the local population to utter poverty and lawlessness. It is under this rule that this nation of 6 million people has been turned into a virtual island prison where in fact there are 35 prison buildings for every school and 190 soldiers for every schoolteacher. Haiti has become perhaps one of the few countries in the world that officially mandated the death penalty for so-called communist activity, which covers broadly any opposition to the regime. Unsurprisingly it was considered a miracle if a detainee survived beyond the 2d year of imprisonment. Hundreds of millions of United States dollars have passed through the Duvaliers' hands and they have precious little to show for it except personal wealth. Even at the height of repression in that country the dictatorship received from the United States through various channels something like $150 million a year. And as a result of massive demonstrations of late, the only chance for Washington to retain the Duvalier regime was to stage a bloodbath, to pile corpses on corpses. Bitter lessons of history, however, overruled that course of action. No amount of United States dollars, it became apparent, would buy much more time for the Haitian tyranny. And it is a sad irony that a country that professes promotion of human rights around the world should have been the one to provide Haitian dictator with a getaway plane and find him a safe haven.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON CAPUTO VISIT TO MOSCOW

Luncheon Remarks

PM301645 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Soviet-Argentine Talks"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in honor of [Argentine Foreign Minister] D. Caputo, during which there was an exchange of speeches. The following were present at the luncheon: on the Soviet side -- P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of culture; G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; leaders of a number of ministries and departments and other officials; and on the Argentine side -- the officials accompanying D. Caputo.

Welcoming the guests, E.A. Shevardnadze said: Relations between our two countries have entered their second century and the fact that this second century is opened by your visit, Mr Minister, is a good omen for the future. We can feel justified satisfaction with the way in which Soviet-Argentine relations have developed in recent years.

Particular significance for these relations, is attached to the contacts established by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Argentine President Raul Alfonsin. Political dialogue at the highest level on major questions of world policy sets the tone for our relations, creating the necessary mutual understanding and trust. I would say the Soviet Union and Argentina can serve as a good example of the practical implementation of a policy of peaceful coexistence between states and equal, mutual advantageous cooperation in all spheres, based on respect for each other's interests, positions, and viewpoints.

The talks held have once again shown that in their relations our two countries are following the correct path and that ahead of us are good prospects and broad scope for the development of ties and the deepening of collaboration in international affairs.

One cannot but feel satisfaction with the fact that Argentina plays an active part in questions of war and peace, where its voice is weighty and authoritative. Your country has taken its place in the front ranks of the states advocating the elimination of the nuclear danger, the lessening of tension, and the strengthening of universal security.

We value highly Argentina's position with regard to the Soviet Union's new initiative, put forward in the 15 January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The program for the earth's complete liberation from nuclear weaons, the prevention of the militarization of space, the elimination of chemical weapons and other means of mass destruction, and the implementation of measures aimed at lessening the danger of war and strengthening peace has met with support from the Argentine Government. This attitude is expressed in the reply message from R. Alfonsin to M.S. Gorbachev which you handed over.

If it proves possible to implement this program and thereby put an end to the threat of the destruction of life itself on earth, people will be grateful to your country also. They will remember that Argentina was not only among those who expressed concern about mankind's future and warned of the looming disaster, but was also one of those who actively sought to bring closer a nuclear-free world, a world with no weapons in space, a world in which countries compete not to create instruments of destruction, but to secure a better life for their peoples.

We value the fact that the Argentine Government shares the Soviet Union's viewpoint that an end to nuclear weapons tests and all nuclear explosions is necessary in order to stop the nuclear arms race, create the prerequisites for nuclear disarmament, and embark on its practical implementation.

Argentina's willingness, jointly with the other countries which signed the Delhi Declaration a year ago, to engage in practical work to promote the establishment, as a first step, of a mutual Soviet-U.S. moratorium on nuclear explosions and the Argentine side's understanding of the significance of the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on such explosions confirm the Argentine Government's responsible, mature approach to the task of going over to truly lasting and reliable peace.

This stance on Argentina's part creates a good basis for collaboration between our two countries in achieving the goal set in M.S. Gorbachev's statement -- the complete elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons by the year 2000 and the implementation of other disarmament and confidence-building measures. Our cooperation and the coordination of our efforts in this matter would meet the vital interests of all the peoples -- the interests of peace and stability.

We and the Argentine side also have a common understanding of the importance of pooling states' efforts as regards the assertion and observance of the principles of the UN Charter, above all in defense of the sovereignty and independence of states and the peoples' rights to independent development and the choice of their own path without outside interference.

Argentina, which has experienced for itself the effect that a colonialist policy can have on the peoples and which knows the value of international solidarity in defending one's rights, comes out actively in favor of the political settlement of regional conflict situations.

In the course of the talks with you, we paid particular attention to the tense situation prevailing in Central America. The norms of international law sanctified by the UN Charter are being violated there. It is a question of a policy of pressure and threats against the sovereign State of Nicaragua and attempts to interfere in its affairs, impose an alien order on that country's people, and deprive them of the opportunity to determine their own destiny.

The Soviet Union, which invariably comes out in defense of the sovereign rights of the Nicaraguan people and other peoples and in favor of a just political settlement in Central America, gives due credit for the efforts of Latin American countries in this direction. In this connection it is pleasing to note the growing role of an influential country like Argentina, which raises its voice against interference in Central America and calls for the creation of conditions facilitating the attainment of lasting peace in that region.

We are profoundly convinced that with the cooperation of all peace-loving states and political forces it will be possible to avert the threat of conflict in Central America and give the peoples of that region the opportunity to follow their own path and tackle urgent matters of economic and social development without fear of outside interference.

Equally, serious concern must be caused by the tense situation which persists in the south Atlantic. The Soviet Union resolutely condemns the course of militarization of that region. This policy constitutes a direct threat to all Latin American states, and not only them, because in this way a dangerous seat of conflict is perpetuated there.

As for the problem of the Malvinas Islands, we support Argentina's line -- permeated by good will -- of a peaceful settlement by means of talks with Britain on the basis of the existing UN decisions.

In the course of the talks we paid particular attention to problems of international economic relations. The serious difficulties and obstacles created by the policy of the major capitalist states in the path of the development of these relations on a sound, just footing strike cruelly at the interests of the developing countries. The huge and ever increasing foreign debt is an insuperable well in the path of the socio-economic progress of those countries' peoples. We agreed that this situation is intolerable. We also agree that disarmament and economic development are linked in the most direct way. I wish to stress that the program proposed by the Soviet Union for nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in space shows the way to the resolution of today's most complex problems, including problems of an economic order.

A whole series of practical steps are also contained in the memorandum which we have just sent to the UN secretary general on "The International Economic Security of States -- an Important Condition for the Improvement of International Economic Relations." We have a mutual understanding on this question too.

Looking at the future of Soviet-Argentine relations, we see a clear horizon. The important agreements we have signed today consolidate what has been achieved and place our relations on a firmer footing. We have no doubt that the forthcoming visit to our country by Argentine President Raul Alfonsin will be a major event in relations between our two countries and will lift them to a new, higher level.

In his reply speech D. Caputo said that the honor of being the first Argentine foreign minister to visit the Soviet Union has fallen to him. This visit is important, he stressed, because relations between Argentina and the Soviet Union are taking on an increasingly intensive nature not only in the sphere of trade, but also in connection with the practice of periodical consultations on the eve of UN General Assembly sessions and the regular exchange of information between representatives of the two countries at various international forums. The minister expressed confidence that the Argentine-Soviet documents signed during his visit will make it possible to extend the two countries' relations still further and consolidate the process of their development for the good of both peoples.

In the international sphere, the visit makes it possible to clarify those spheres where there are considerable areas of common ground between Buenos Aires and Moscow despite their different social systems. This applies first and foremost to questions of ensuring peace and international security.

Dwelling on the main directions of his country's foreign policy, D. Caputo said in particular that Argentina's position is based on respect for other states' sovereignty and defense of its own sovereignty. All countries have the right to self-determination, territorial integrity, and the resolution of their own domestic problems without interference by other states. In this connection the priority task of Argentina's foreign policy is the establishment of the country's political and economic independence, activity for the sake of peace, the defense of human rights and basic freedoms, and opposition to new forms of subjugation.

Peace, the minister said, is the most important, essential condition of relations between states. Given the existence of different social systems, the principle of peaceful coexistence is not only the cornerstone of diplomatic relations between states, but the only means of survival for the planet.

As President Alfonsin has stated, Argentina adheres to a policy line which promotes the attainment of a peaceful solution to conflicts, the maintenance of steps toward disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, and the use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes. It is immoral to divert the vast economic resources which are used daily to create the instruments of destruction while millions of people in the world are starving. Now that mankind faces the urgent task of preserving life on our planet and new horizons are opening up in space, attempts to turn our earth and outer space into a potential theater of hostilities appear extremely irresponsible in the eyes of all mankind.

Argentina, together with the five other countries which signed the Delhi Declaration and with the support of other states which have joined the struggle for peace, has offered the Soviet Union and the United States the broadest assistance in achieving the goals of disarmament. The talks now taking place in Geneva inspire hope in all the peoples of the earth who have an interest in peace.

Argentina assesses very highly the message sent a few days ago by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to President R. Alfonsin about the new Soviet initiatives in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament.

The minister noted that the program put forward by the Soviet Union for complete disarmament by the year 2000 is the most important initiative of all the proposals hitherto put forward in this sphere.

Touching on the situation in the countries of Latin America, D. Caputo said that apart from establishing their political independence, they are currently having to resist new forms of subjugation which are now manifested particularly within the framework of the international financial system. This independence has led to a paradoxical situation: Latin America, an underdeveloped region, is, so to speak, pouring out its life blood in continuing to send funds for the financial enrichment of the developed countries. Argentina seeks not only to strengthen the Latin American countries' positions in the face of the developed states as regards extinguishing the foreign debt, but also to promote the eradication in Latin America of the traditional causes of economic dependence, exacerbated from outside by financial speculation. The expansion of autonomy in resolving questions of economic development, the minister stressed, is a necessary condition for the Latin American countries' exercise of their political sovereignty.

The situation in Central America and the conditions of the Latin American countries' socioeconomic development, D. Caputo said, cannot be resolved in isolation or unilaterally. The crisis in Central America is a threat to peace, development, democracy, and security. The factors which caused it are well known: authoritarianism, flagrant social injustice, poverty. Excluding the people from participating in political and economic life inevitably leads to violence, war, and the lack of security. The Central America problem affects all the continents' countries.

Argentina has always supported the activity of the Contadora Group, regarding it as a machinery capable of ensuring a quest for a lasting solution to the problems of Central American states, and has joined the Contadora support group and recently signed a declaration in Venezuela which offers new hope for a settlement of the situation in the region by means of talks.

Argentina's willingness to resolve the question of the sovereignty of the Malvinas and South Sandwich Islands and South Georgia with Britain by means of dialogue remains unchanged. D. Caputo expressed the gratitude of the Government and people of Argentina to the Soviet Government for its support for UN resolutions on this question. All the problems mentioned, D. Caputo said in conclusion, were subjects of the exchange of opinions which took place between us.

But it is not only their examination, together with the discussion of global problems of peace and disarmament, which makes this visit fruitful. The Soviet Union and Argentina must continue to strengthen their ties and open up a new path to mutual understanding and cooperation. That is particularly true now that the friendly relations between our two peoples are 100 years old and the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between our states is approaching.

The luncheon took place in a friendly atmosphere.

Meeting With Gromyko

PM311254 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talk With an Argentine Minister"]

[Text] On 29 January A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received in the Kremlin Dante Mario Caputo, Argentine minister of foreign relations and worship, and the officials accompanying him, who are in the Soviet Union on an official visit. Some problems of the contemporary international situation and questions of Soviet-Argentine relations were discussed on a broad basis in the course of the talk.

A.A. Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union is consistently continuing the struggle for universal peace. The new historic initiatives set out in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pursue a clear aim -- to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons on our planet in the shortest possible time, in just 15 years.

The Soviet Union has submitted its proposals when certain forces, particularly in NATO countries, are encouraging the development of negative, dangerous trends in policy. These forces are creating the threat of a new war for mankind and forcing the present generation to live in fear of mountains of nuclear weapons. The human race has no wish and no need to exist in this way any longer.

To turn the course of history toward detente -- such is the principled position of the Land of the Soviets. Its foreign policy activity -- before Geneva, at the Geneva Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, and after Geneva -- is geared toward this.

The specific Soviet program for nuclear disarmament by the end of the second millennium has found support among millions of people in the most diverse countries on all continents. Its implementation will make it possible to free peoples of the horrors and nightmares of nuclear insanity, prevent the arms race from spreading into space, and rechannel vast means into eliminating such problems as hunger, illiteracy, poverty, and disease.

Our state, A.A. Gromyko said, has taken an important step along the path to disarmament. The Soviet program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons is fundamentally new and significant in that it is specific in terms of content and time frames of implementation.

Also important in this respect is the Soviet decision to extend by 3 months -- that is, until 31 March 1986 -- its earlier declared unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions. It is now up to the U.S. side. The Soviet Union once again stresses that a radical reduction in nuclear weapons will be possible only when the Soviet Union and the United States renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space-based strike weapons.

The Soviet side stressed that the Soviet leadership highly appraises the efforts of Argentina, which, together with other countries in the "group of six" -- Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- has put forward constructive proposals relating to curtailing the arms race, preventing the militarization of space, and declaring a moratorium on nuclear explosions. The Argentine minister was told that these ideas are consonant with the Soviet approach in resolving these important problems.

The guest's attention was drawn to M.S. Gorbachev's recent message to Argentine President R. Alfonsin. The message contained information on the Soviet initiatives and stressed that it is essential to use every opportunity to establish a bilateral Soviet-U.S. moratorium followed by a complete and general ban on nuclear test explosions.

D. Caputo noted the positive attitude of the Argentine Government toward the Soviet peace initiatives. In this respect he stressed that, as an important political document, the Soviet proposals of 15 January form a good foundation for resolving in practice the questions of arms limitation and disarmament.

Examining the situation in Central America, the Soviet side confirmed its support for a peaceful political settlement in this region with strict observance of sovereignty and of the peoples' right to themselves decide how they must live and what course they must take. D. Caputo expressed concern in regard to the tension in Central America and stated the wish of Argentina and other Latin American countries to help to remove this tension.

Discussing bilateral ties between the Soviet Union and Argentina, the sides noted their ongoing development with satisfaction. Interparliamentary contacts were discussed in particular. The opinion that fuller use be made of possibilities to expand cooperation between the two countries in the most diverse spheres on a mutually advantageous and stable basis was expressed. The Soviet Union hopes that the forthcoming visit to Moscow by President R. Alfonsin will have great significance for deepening mutual understanding on cardinal issues of the present and for developing Soviet-Argentine relations.

The sides expressed their understanding that the situation in the international arena urgently requires that statesmen justify the peoples' hopes for peace.

On the Soviet side, the talk was attended by T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; Yu.I. Volskiy, chief of the Second Latin America Department of the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs; and O.K. Kvasov, USSR ambassador to Argentina; and on the Argentine side by F. Bravo, Argentine ambassador to the USSR.

'Vremya' Interview

LD301743 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 30 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Caputo, minister of foreign relations and worship of the Republic of Argentina, left Moscow for Leningrad today. He is in our country on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government. Before his departure by air, Dante Caputo stated in an interview for the "Vremya" program:

[Caputo in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation] I regard the results of my visit as very positive.

Diplomatic relations between our countries have existed for 100 years. A decade ago Soviet-Argentine commercial relations began to develop at a fast pace. Now, I would say, we have entered the third stage of our relations. We have had an opportunity to hold political consultations on matters of interest to both sides and to find points of contact and common positions. I think we have carried out our task and a specific step forward has been taken in relations between our countries.

Despite differences in our political and social structures great opportunities exist for cooperation in different spheres including the economic, commercial, technical and other spheres. There is also to be an expansion of political contacts and consultations. In the future -- and I consider this very important -- we shall strive to unite our efforts in the struggle against the nuclear war threat and for disarmament, detente, and peace throughout the globe.

Press Conference Remarks

PM031139 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Soviet-Argentine Talks"]

[Text] D. Caputo held a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. Expressing profound gratitude to the Soviet Government for its warm reception, the minister noted the consistent development of Argentine-Soviet relations and a coincidence of views on many international problems.

We rate highly the Soviet initiatives put forward in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, he stressed. We consider it necessary to halt the arms race on earth and prevent it in space. Argentina's attitude toward the Soviet decision to unilaterally extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions by 3 months is positive. The guest noted the successful development of economic relations with the Soviet Union. Argentina rates highly Soviet assistance in the construction of hydroelectric power facilities and is interested in acquiring Soviet machinery and equipment, he said.

The minister answered journalists' questions.

Leningrad Visit

LD312328 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Text] Caputo, minister of foreign affairs and worship of the Argentine Republic, is acquainting himself with the city on the Neva. Today he was received by the Executive Committee of the Leningrad Soviet. The minister visited the Piskarev Memorial Cemetery, where he honored the memory of Leningraders and servicemen who fell in the years of the last war. He also visited the Vladimir Ilich Lenin Memorial Museum at Smolnyy.

Visit Completion

LD011832 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 1 Feb 86

[Text] Leningrad, February 1 TASS -- The Minister of Foreign Affairs and Religion of the Argentine Republic Dante Caputo left the Soviet Union today. He was in the USSR on an official visit at the Soviet Government's invitation.